INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR IN ENGLAND:

DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE IN GENERIC AND SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PROVISION

A REPORT BY RON THOMPSON
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD

GATSBY

GATSBY IS A FOUNDATION SET UP
BY DAVID SAINSBURY
TO REALISE HIS CHARITABLE OBJECTIVES.
WE FOCUS OUR SUPPORT ON A LIMITED
NUMBER OF AREAS:

PLANT SCIENCE RESEARCH

NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH

SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH AND ADVICE

THE ARTS

WE ARE PROACTIVE IN DEVISING PROJECTS
TO ACHIEVE OUR AIMS. WE ARE ENTHUSIASTIC
ABOUT SUPPORTING INNOVATION. WE ARE
ANALYTICAL AS WE BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT
TO UNDERSTAND THE OPPORTUNITIES
AND PROBLEMS WE TACKLE. WE TAKE A
LONG-TERM VIEW AS WE DO NOT THINK MUCH
CAN BE ACHIEVED BY SHORT, ONE-OFF
PROJECTS. WE ARE ALWAYS EAGER TO FORM
PARTNERSHIPS WITH ORGANISATIONS WHO
SHARE OUR GOALS.

The Gatsby Charitable Foundation
The Peak, 5 Wilton Road, London SW1V 1AP
T +44 (0)20 7410 0330 F +44 (0)20 7410 0332
www.gatsby.org.uk

CONTENTS

	page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
The context of ITE for the education and training sector	1
The current system of ITE for the education and training sector	2
ITE and subject-specialist pedagogy	3
1 INTRODUCTION	5
SECTION 1 THE CONTEXT OF ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR	8
1.1 The education and training sector in England and its workforce	8
1.2 The development of ITE for the education and training sector	13
1.3 The 2007 regulations	17
1.4 Regulation, de-regulation and beyond	20
SECTION 2 AN OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ROUTES THROUGH ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR	24
SECTION 3 ITE ROUTES AND SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY	31
3.1 Identifying the problem: deficiencies in subject-specialist pedagogy	32
3.2 What is subject-specialist pedagogy?	34
3.3 Developing subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE	40
3.4 Subject pedagogy and the current system of qualifications	43
APPENDIX 1 National teaching standards for the education and training sector	46
APPENDIX 2 The academic levels of ITE qualifications for the education and training sector	49
REFERENCES	51
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	58

TABLES

Table 1: Institutions and the teaching workforce in the education and training sector	10
Table 2: Highest qualification of FE teaching staff (2003-04)	11
Table 3: Highest qualification of teaching staff in work-based learning (WBL) and adult and community learning (ACL) (2011-12)	12
Table 4: Highest teaching qualification of FE teaching staff (2004-10)	12

FIGURES

Figure 1: Routes through Initial Teacher Education for the education and training sector in England in 2014	29
Figure 2: The 2007 system of Initial Teacher Education qualifications for the Lifelong Learning Sector in England	30
Figure 3: A model of subject knowledge for teaching	36
Figure 4: Modalities for developing subject-specific pedagogical knowledge	41

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly grateful to Jenifer Burden from the Gatsby Charitable Foundation for her encouragement throughout the preparation of this report, and for her unfailing enthusiasm for mapping the sometimes bewildering complexity of teacher education in the education and training sector. I would also like to thank Hannah Stanwix for her support in preparing the report for publication.

Financial support from the Gatsby Charitable Foundation is gratefully acknowledged. I would also like to thank Roy Fisher and Robin Simmons for advice and comments on early drafts of the report. Any remaining errors or infelicities are entirely my own responsibility.

Ron Thompson
School of Education and Professional Development
University of Huddersfield
r.thompson@hud.ac.uk

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The language used to describe the education and training sector, and also the specific area of teacher education, has been rather fluid over the period discussed in this report, particularly in recent years. In general, this report uses the term 'education and training sector' to describe what at other times has been referred to by such terms as 'further education', 'lifelong learning', 'post-compulsory education and training'. However, in some places terminology in common use at the time has been preferred, for example 'lifelong learning' during the New Labour years. Similarly, in this report 'teacher education' is generally preferred to 'teacher training', although this is not always adhered to and students following initial teacher education courses are often referred to as trainees.

The term 'disabled learner' is used in accordance with the Initial Guidance for Users of the Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers in Education and Training – England (ETF, 2014c), in which it has been used 'to signify the inclusion of any student with a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'.

DISCLAIMER

The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily state or reflect those of the Gatsby Charitable Foundation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reviews the current system of initial teacher education (ITE) for the education and training sector and its development from earlier systems. The report also discusses subject-specialist teaching in the education and training sector, leading to a provisional assessment of the potential of the current ITE system for enhancing subject-specialist pedagogy. The report begins by contextualising the development of ITE from the post-war period to the beginning of the New Labour years, followed by a more detailed discussion of the reforms introduced by Labour governments in 2001 and 2007 and the moves away from regulation introduced by the Conservative–Liberal Democrat Coalition government. The report then discusses the main features of the qualifications framework established following the Lingfield Review of 2011-12. The final part of the report focuses on the development of subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE courses, relating concerns expressed by Ofsted to debates about teacher knowledge and vocational pedagogies. A model for understanding approaches to subject-specialist pedagogy is developed, and applied to consider the potential of the current ITE system for strengthening this area of professional development.

THE CONTEXT OF ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

The education and training sector is complex and diverse, comprising colleges of further education (FE), providers of work-based learning and adult education, and training activities in charities or companies whose main business is not education or training. Teaching staff in the sector have not, until relatively recently, been required to hold a teaching qualification, and the overwhelming majority of ITE trainees in FE are in-service, a situation arising partly from the vocational nature of the education and training curriculum. However, there has also been a *cultural* tendency to undervalue ITE. Although a requirement for new teachers in FE and the wider education and training sector to undertake initial training has existed since 2001, less than two-thirds of the FE college workforce is considered to be fully qualified.

Developments in ITE for the education and training sector since 2001

Following the Labour election victory in 1997, the notion of lifelong learning acquired a key role in Government policy, leading to an unprecedented focus on teacher education for the education and training sector, in contrast to its earlier history of 'benign neglect'. By 2001 national standards for FE teachers had been introduced, along with a statutory requirement for new teachers to hold a recognised teaching qualification. However, the impact of the 2001 reforms was less than might be expected, and by 2004 only 47% of part-time staff and 70% of full-time staff were qualified, compared with 25% and 66% respectively in 1996-97. In 2003, Ofsted produced a survey report which severely criticised existing provision. Such concerns about the ability of the existing ITE system to produce teachers of sufficient quality led the Government to promise a 'step change' in training. These further reforms, introduced in 2007, comprised three main strands: new teaching standards for the 'lifelong learning sector'; a framework of teaching qualifications corresponding to defined teaching roles; and measures to improve workplace learning and partnerships between colleges, universities and other providers.

Aspirations for parity of esteem with school teaching had long been a feature of attempts to reform ITE for the education and training sector, and the 2007 reforms also introduced the status of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS), analogous to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) in schools. As well as continuing to recognise the traditional university awards of Cert Ed and PGCE, the new qualifications structure included a somewhat confusing array of awards administered by national awarding organisations – the 6-credit award *Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector* (PTLLS), the 24-credit qualification *Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector* (CTLLS) and the 120-credit qualification *Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector* (DTLLS). Whilst DTLLS proved well-respected across the sector, having a clear relationship with earlier awarding organisation awards and the university Cert Ed, the smaller qualifications were problematic in terms of credibility and progression. Although some revisions were introduced in 2011, these awards came in for particularly severe criticism in the first Lingfield Report of 2012.

Regulation, de-regulation and beyond

The 2007 reforms failed to have a dramatic impact before the 2010 general election. Analysis of workforce data showed that of 14,433 teachers who had joined the sector since September 2007, only 5.5% had achieved QTLS or the lower status of Associate Teacher Learning and Skills. Despite this, an evaluation of the reforms conducted by the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills concluded that, whilst problems did exist, good progress was being made. A less positive evaluation was provided by Lucas et al. (2012), who argued that the 2007 system was excessively complex and still poorly understood by employers. However, the formation of a Conservative–Liberal Democrat Coalition government created a markedly different political environment for these debates. Austerity and de-regulation underpinned the replacement of the ideas behind a national, regulated system of professional development by a more market-driven philosophy. In September 2011, the government announced the formation of a panel, under the chairmanship of Lord Lingfield, to review 'the current arrangements to regulate and facilitate the professionalism of the FE and skills workforce'.

In contrast to the BIS evaluation report, the first Lingfield report was scathing in its criticism of the 2007 reforms. The recommendations of this report included revocation of the 2007 regulations and the simplification and renaming of initial teaching qualifications. The final Lingfield report was largely concerned with the nature of FE professionalism, and welcomed the government's earlier proposal to establish an employer-led 'guild' for further education. This body finally emerged in August 2013, renamed the Education and Training Foundation.

THE CURRENT SYSTEM OF ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

Although a standardised national system of initial teaching qualifications still exists in England, participation is voluntary. In spite of the intentions of Lord Lingfield, the system remains complex and there is a wide variety of routes within it. These routes may be analysed in terms of mode of study (pre-service or in-service; part-time or full-time), the purpose of the route (training for a full teaching role or more limited roles such as assessor), and the nature of the awarding institution (higher education institution or national awarding organisation). As in earlier qualification systems, the university awards of Cert Ed and PGCE provide in certain senses a

benchmark, but the qualification structure itself uses a different terminology and like the 2007 system contains some awards which are significantly smaller and at lower levels than a Cert Ed or PGCE. The current 'core' awards are:

- *Award in Education and Training* (12 credits at Level 3) – essentially an introductory award for those new to teaching.
- *Certificate in Education and Training* (36 credits at Level 4) – a more advanced award for those with significant roles in teaching or supporting learning.
- *Diploma in Education and Training* (120 credits at Level 5) – an award comparable to a university Cert Ed, intended for those in a full teaching role.

In addition, a range of specialist awards exist at Diploma level, aimed at those teaching disabled learners or the specific subjects English (literacy or English for speakers of other languages – ESOL) and mathematics (numeracy).

ITE AND SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY

Concerns over the subject-specialist knowledge of teachers are not new, nor confined to the education and training sector. However, they have been particularly acute within this sector for a variety of reasons. When Ofsted took responsibility for the inspection of ITE for further education in 2001, a survey inspection of providers conducted in 2002-03 highlighted deficiencies in the development of both subject knowledge and subject-specific pedagogical knowledge. Although Ofsted found that the quality of generic training was generally good, nevertheless they concluded that trainees' teaching was affected adversely by their limited knowledge of how to teach their subject. These criticisms led to a flurry of activity within the sector, particularly in relation to subject-specific mentoring. Some providers also strengthened the subject-specific content of the formal aspects of their programmes, and blended learning approaches were developed to overcome the logistical problems of constituting viable subject-specialist groups in such a diverse sector. However, in spite of these improvements, progress was slow, and Ofsted noted in a 2009 review that variability in the quality of subject-specialist support remained problematic (Ofsted 2009).

The reasons for this situation are varied, and although political issues such as underfunding for mentor support are often cited, there are also more fundamental factors involved. Teachers in the education and training sector often have subject qualifications below degree level, and a significant proportion have only Level 3 qualifications; although they may be expert vocational practitioners, their expertise may be held tacitly rather than in terms of codified knowledge, providing challenges to their development of teaching strategies. Moreover, the enormous range of specialisms in the education and training sector makes the development of subject-specific pedagogy conceptually difficult, with the very notion of a 'subject' eluding definition. Whilst certain academic subjects – for example physics, mathematics or sociology – may be fairly well-defined, with specific bodies of knowledge concerning content and pedagogy readily available, many subject areas in the education and training sector are not at all like this. For example, subjects such as engineering are 'regional' rather than 'singular' – drawing on a range of disciplines which are synthesised along vocational rather than academic principles. Others are generic, concerned with employability or life skills. This leaves open the questions of whether distinctive pedagogies even exist in certain vocational areas, and also how trainee teachers might best develop their pedagogical knowledge and skills.

This report explores possible modes for developing subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE programmes, classifying them according to whether a distinctive body of pedagogical knowledge exists, and whether discrete provision for subject areas occurs in the ITE programme. It argues that the relative effectiveness of these modes can only be decided empirically, rather than a priori, and calls for further research on how trainee teachers acquire and use subject-specialist pedagogy. The report highlights the role of mentors in effective ITE, but argues that the quality of teacher educators is another key factor.

The preceding discussions provide a basis for evaluating the potential of current ITE routes for developing subject-specialist pedagogy. It is unlikely that, in most subject areas, the Award in Education and Training or the Certificate in Education and Training could provide sufficient opportunity for an adequate treatment of subject-specialist pedagogy. This leaves the Level 5 Diplomas and their university equivalents. In some ways, it might appear that subject areas having a distinctive body of pedagogical knowledge would benefit from the specialist diploma model, in which specialist core content is defined in the curriculum. However, there are two possible objections to this. Firstly, as noted earlier, the effectiveness of these modes should be treated as an empirical question. Secondly, experience with the specialist Diplomas indicates that the viability of ITE programmes may be affected, or the trainee experience diminished by the very small groupings arising from an excessively specialist focus. Alternatively, a specialist focus in the curriculum could be developed within a less specialised delivery model. This would require greatly enhanced mentor training, and also training for teacher educators to enable them to manage more effectively trainees from different subject areas. It would also create a need for blended learning approaches so that broader issues raised in generic or regional groups could be pursued in a subject-specific way.

The approaches indicated above are not necessarily appropriate for subject areas without a distinctive pedagogy. In such cases, fully generic groups led by tutors skilled in eliciting key generic pedagogical knowledge from diverse experiences and contexts may be the most effective mode of delivery. The idea of vocational pedagogy could be of great importance in providing unifying principles which would structure the relationship between the specialist context and generic pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

Initial teacher education (ITE) for the education and training sector in England is characterised by diversity and complexity, reflecting the complex nature of the sector itself. Although widely recognised as an important contributor to the nation's economic competitiveness, education and training has in the past been described as a 'Cinderella sector', suffering from a 'benign neglect' in which successive governments developed only piecemeal responses to the challenges facing the sector, including the professional development of its teaching staff. In more recent times – particularly since the 1997 general election and Tony Blair's slogan of 'education, education, education' – the sector has received greatly increased attention and increased funding[1]; however, it continues to reflect this earlier history. Some of the key points relevant to the ways in which ITE for the education and training sector has developed include:

- There are well-known difficulties in defining the sector, arising from its diversity and complex history. Variously described over the years by terms such as 'further education', 'post-compulsory education and training', 'learning and skills', 'lifelong learning' and 'FE and skills', the education and training sector includes the activities of many different types of institution, including colleges of further education (FE), sixth-form colleges, adult education centres, work-based learning providers, voluntary organisations, and higher education institutions. Even when higher education is excluded, the range of provision is so broad as to pose extremely difficult challenges to developing a coherent national system of ITE for teachers in the education and training sector.
- The vocational nature of much provision in the education and training sector both increases the range of pedagogical approaches that must be anticipated when designing national systems of ITE, and multiplies the 'subject specialisms' or client groups which must be encompassed by them. Subject boundaries tend to be more diffuse than in school teaching, and many vocational courses draw on more than just one or two disciplines. Furthermore, in vocational education there is considerable debate and uncertainty over the status and meaning of terms such as knowledge and skill, partly because of difficulties in conceptualising vocational knowledge and learning but also because of successive policy interventions whose directions have not always been well-aligned (Bathmaker 2013).
- Vocational courses, by their nature, require experienced practitioners to teach them. This has led to a situation in which ITE normally takes place following appointment to a teaching post, rather than preceding it as in most school teaching posts. The great majority of ITE provision for the sector is therefore part-time, in-service rather than full-time, pre-service. Moreover, newly-appointed teachers – particularly in smaller providers – may have limited opportunities for mentorship and support in the early months of their teaching career, creating a 'skills gap' between what is expected of these teachers and their stage of professional development.

1 Over the period 1998-2009 government spending on further education increased by an average of 7.7% a year in real terms (2.7% in per-student funding), although some of these increases have been rolled back since 2010 (Chowdry and Sibieta 2011).

- The education and training sector has traditionally provided 'second-chance' educational opportunities for young people who have not succeeded at school. Although in many cases these opportunities are taken up voluntarily and enthusiastically, since the late 1970s youth training schemes, pre-vocational programmes and present-day mandated training programmes have brought less willing learners into the sector. Such courses are often more concerned with developing generic or 'life' skills rather than specific vocational or disciplinary knowledge. They provide distinctive pedagogical challenges for teachers, further increasing the demands placed on ITE programmes.
- Historically, the proportion of fully-qualified teachers in the sector has been relatively low, and for many years this proportion has remained below 60%. The situation has been exacerbated by successive waves of reform and change, dating back to the incorporation of colleges in 1993 and significant job losses in the aftermath, but also including the teaching workforce reforms of the New Labour years (Lucas 2004a). This 'endless change' (Beale 2004; Edward et al. 2007) is generally agreed to have had a destabilising influence on professional development in the sector.
- More broadly, most authorities agree that professional identity within the education and training sector is somewhat insecure (Gleeson, Davies and Wheeler 2005; Gleeson and James 2007). Although the notion of 'dual professionalism', in which teachers are encouraged to retain their identity as expert subject-specialist or vocational practitioners whilst developing a new identity as a professional educator, has been popular in recent years, there is still a tendency to equate teaching ability with subject expertise.

The challenging environment for ITE and continuing professional development in the sector described above has led to over 15 years of workforce reforms aimed at developing increased professionalism and higher standards of teaching and learning. The New Labour approach to this 'professionalisation agenda' was based on statutory requirements for teaching qualifications and national standards for teachers in the sector. This process reached a peak with the 2007 workforce regulations, which created the new professional status of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS), a new system of teaching qualifications, compulsory membership of a new professional body – the Institute for Learning (IfL) – and mandatory continuing professional development (Thompson and Robinson 2008). Evidence on the effectiveness of the 2007 regulations was somewhat mixed, and the view taken by the incoming Conservative–Liberal Democrat Coalition government was that continuing with a statutory system would be both ineffective and inconsistent with the more market-driven approaches it favoured across the public sector. Following the first Lingfield report in March 2012, the dismantling of the 2007 regulations began, to be replaced by a more voluntaristic and employer-led system in which teaching qualifications, membership of professional bodies, and other aspects of professionalism would be a matter between teachers and their employers.

The period 2013-14 has therefore been a time of significant change for ITE in the education and training sector. An urgent review of teaching qualifications, conducted by the Learning and Skills Improvement Service (LSIS) following the first Lingfield report, led to the introduction of a new suite of qualifications from September 2013[2]. A new, employer-led body with responsibility for workforce

2 Higher education institutions were not required to adopt the titles or structure of these new qualifications, but were expected to embed certain mandatory content and to follow LSIS guidance on other aspects of ITE, such as the number of assessed teaching observations.

development, the Education and Training Foundation, was established in August 2013, and revised professional standards developed by the Foundation were released in May 2014. Furthermore, Ofsted is introducing a new inspection framework for ITE in all sectors of education, less than two years after the current framework came into being.

This report aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the current system of ITE routes within the education and training sector, indicating how it has developed from earlier systems and its relationship with the social, economic and political factors outlined above. The report also provides a discussion of issues relating to subject-specialist teaching in the education and training sector, leading to a provisional assessment of the potential of the current ITE system for enhancing subject-specialist pedagogy. The report is structured in three sections.

Section 1 begins by defining the sector and discussing the size and composition of its workforce. The development of ITE for the education and training sector from the post-war period to the beginning of the New Labour years is then briefly traced, followed by a more detailed discussion of the reforms introduced by Labour governments in 2001 and 2007. Finally, the moves away from regulation introduced by the Conservative–Liberal Democrat Coalition government are discussed.

Section 2 consists of a detailed discussion of the current system of ITE, beginning with an overview of the various modes of study for beginning teachers encountered in the education and training sector, followed by an outline of the main features of the qualifications framework established by the LSIS review of 2012-13. Diagrams showing the various routes and levels are provided.

Section 3 focuses on the development of subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE courses, relating concerns about the issue expressed particularly by Ofsted to debates about teacher knowledge and vocational pedagogies. A model for understanding various approaches to subject-specialist pedagogy is developed, and applied to consider the potential of the current ITE system for strengthening subject-specialist provision in ITE.

Finally, the Appendices provide greater detail on two specific issues identified in passing in the main body of the report: the development of national teaching standards for the education and training sector, and the academic levels of ITE programmes in the sector.

The general issue of teacher professionalism in education and training is not discussed in detail in the report. However, the ways in which professionalism has been and is conceived is an important factor in debates about ITE and subject-specialist pedagogy. The reader is referred to Robson (2006) and Avis (2009) for thorough treatments of professionalism in the education and training sector.

SECTION 1 THE CONTEXT OF ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

1.1 THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR IN ENGLAND AND ITS WORKFORCE

The education and training sector is complex and highly diverse (see, for example, Avis et al. 2010, pp. 7-17). Often characterised as all organisations providing education and training to those aged over 16, other than schools, the sector includes colleges of further education[3] (FE), work-based learning providers, adult education providers, and the training wings of charities or companies whose main business is not education or training. Recently, it has become possible to think of the sector as the range of organisations coming within the remit of the Education and Training Foundation, the employer-led organisation which supports 'all teachers, trainers, leaders and other staff who are in the business of vocational training, adult education, workforce development or other post-16 educational activity' (ETF 2014a). This includes staff working in organisations such as FE colleges, training providers, community learning and skills providers, employers funded to deliver training and Apprenticeships, prisons, independent specialist colleges and sixth-form colleges.

It is necessary to supplement these definitions with a number of caveats. Firstly, FE colleges increasingly provide education and training for those under the age of 16, arrangements which have grown organically over a number of years (Avis et al. 2010, p. 102; Orr 2010), but have recently been formalised following recommendations arising from the Wolf Review of Vocational Education (Wolf 2011, p.129). This formalisation (DfE 2013) includes explicit criteria for the quality of provision in colleges, some of which have direct implications for the training and development of teaching staff – for example, in subject knowledge, quality of teaching, and behaviour management. Secondly, use of the term 'post-compulsory education'[4] as an alternative descriptor for the education and training sector has become less appropriate as Raising Participation Age legislation has taken effect (Maguire 2013), so that participating 16- and 17-year-olds can now be regarded as engaged in 'compulsory' education in some sense. Thirdly, the scale and diversity of the sector means that it eludes precise definition, and consistent data on employers and the teaching workforce is not easy to obtain or interpret. Even the terminology used to describe the sector can be confusing, often shifting with changes in government policy. Terms such as 'lifelong learning sector', 'learning and skills sector', 'FE and skills sector' have been used to describe all or part of the education and training sector, often interchangeably and separated from their original policy context. To avoid such confusions, this report will use the term 'education and training sector' to describe the institutions listed in Table 1

3 This includes general FE colleges and sixth-form colleges; specialist institutions such as colleges of agriculture, horticulture, art and design, and performing arts; and other specialist colleges with a national remit (BIS 2012a, p.24). Sixth-form colleges are culturally and historically somewhat distinct from other areas of the FE sector, and will not be a central focus of this report.

4 Prior to 2007, 'post-compulsory education and training' was commonly used to describe the education and training sector, and it retains some currency in discussions of the sector. Many authors include higher education institutions within the compass of post-compulsory education and training, which is of course consistent with the term 'post-compulsory'. In this report, post-compulsory education will normally be used interchangeably with the education and training sector, and will therefore exclude institutions whose main concern is higher education; however, the importance of higher education provision in further education colleges must not be overlooked, and FE teachers engaged in teaching higher education courses fall within the scope of the report. This is reflected in some ITE courses for the sector, which include content relevant to teaching in higher education and may be accredited by the Higher Education Academy.

'Institutions and the teaching workforce in the education and training sector'. An exception to this is in the discussion of the 2007 reforms where it is more appropriate to use the terminology 'lifelong learning sector', which was embedded in much of the contemporary literature.

Data collated in 2013 by the Learning and Skills Improvement Service (LSIS) suggested that there were over 20,000 employers in what it called the 'further education, skills and wider lifelong learning sector'. This included 3,985 organisations which come within the specific remit of this report: around 400 FE colleges (including sixth-form and specialist colleges) and a further 3,500 organisations, mostly WBL providers but also including some concerned with ACL. The balance of employers was made up of nearly 17,000 providers of Community Learning and Development – including ACL provision, family and youth work, and other development activities (LSIS 2013a, p.4). The LSIS data also identified a further 4,000 organisations providing educational support services or library and archive services. A perhaps more authoritative picture is provided by Table 1, based on analysis of data from a range of sources by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills as part of an evaluation of the 2007 reforms. The table gives a breakdown of employment in the education and training sector in 2011.

Unlike their counterparts in schools, FE teachers and most other teaching staff in the education and training sector have not, until relatively recently, been required to undertake *initial* teacher education. Even the term *initial* is problematic, for whilst in schools teachers are normally trained *pre-service*, before taking up employment, those in FE are often trained concurrently with their teaching employment, as *in-service* trainees. Indeed, prior to 2001 it was not uncommon for FE teachers to remain untrained, even – or perhaps especially – those with considerable experience. In the education and training sector, it is therefore usual to distinguish between pre-service and in-service ITE, the former normally taken full-time, whilst the latter is taken part-time and in conjunction with either part-time or full-time employment as a teacher. The overwhelming majority of ITE trainees in FE are in-service, and according to a report for the Institute for Learning, 90% of trainees in 2011 were in this category[5] (IfL 2011).

Such a situation has arisen partly from considerations of teacher supply. The vocational nature of much of the FE curriculum requires most teachers to have qualifications and work experience in a 'primary occupation' distinct from teaching; a teaching career in FE often develops alongside or out of their primary occupation. Moreover, the need for up-to-date practitioners has often led employers to recruit staff without teaching qualifications, directly from industry. Although a number of financial incentives, such as bursaries, have been used to encourage intending teachers to train as full-time, pre-service students, many individuals find this financially impractical and the likely costs – both financial and in terms of short-term labour supply – have made governments understandably reluctant to embrace the notion of compulsory pre-service training. However, there has also been a *cultural* tendency in the FE system to undervalue ITE, particularly as a pre-service requirement. Extensive knowledge and experience of the skills, norms and values of the primary occupation have often been seen as providing sufficient grounding for a teaching career in FE, and such views may lead to the assumption that pedagogy, if not entirely synonymous with subject

5 This proportion is reversed for school ITE, in which just over 10% of trainees follow employment-based routes such as salaried School Direct and Teach First (DfE 2012; 2014).

knowledge, will automatically flow from it. Teaching skills have been seen as something to be 'picked up' through experience; as Robson (2006, p.14) notes: 'The assumption has been … that if I know my subject, I can, by definition, teach it to others.'

Table 1: Institutions and the teaching workforce in the education and training sector (FE colleges, work-based learning (WBL) providers, and adult and community learning (ACL) providers)

Sub-sector	Number of employers	Size of overall workforce	Size of teaching workforce	Proportion of all teachers in the education and training sector (%)
FE colleges	357*	247,859	122,578	65.3
ACL	185	N/A	35,000	18.7
WBL	1,515	30,000 (publicly funded)		16.0
Total	**2,057**	**–**	**187,578**	**100**

Source: BIS (2012a, p.23)

* This includes 229 general FE colleges, 91 sixth-form colleges, 16 special colleges (agriculture and horticulture); 8 national specialist colleges; 8 specialist designated colleges; 4 special colleges (art, design and performing arts); 1 unclassifiable college.

Whilst these views were in stark contrast to the situation obtaining in school teaching, and were increasingly regarded as outdated under the pressure of New Labour reforms in further education, they have acquired a new impetus under the Coalition government. Current policies emphasise the notion of teaching as a craft, whose skills are picked up through practice and experience, alongside notions of diversity and choice in which deregulation in many areas of teaching employment are supported by assumptions similar to those identified above. It is therefore highly unlikely that there will be any serious challenge to the overwhelmingly in-service nature of ITE in the education and training sector in the foreseeable future.

The education and training sector is characterised by a number of tensions arising from class-based attitudes to vocational education. Although in the post-war period and, arguably, up to the 1970s, FE colleges were popularly associated with technical and vocational education for a working-class elite, and as providing opportunities for social mobility to many working class and lower middle class young people attending evening classes and day-release courses (Raffe 1979; Thompson and Simmons 2013), they generally enjoyed lower status than school sixth forms and universities. Particularly following the collapse of the youth labour market and the rise of training schemes for unemployed young people under the auspices of the Manpower Services Commission and its successors, FE colleges were often seen, not only as 'second-chance' institutions, but largely for 'other people's children' (Richardson 2007; Thompson 2009). These views have been exacerbated by successive failures to create a unified system of 16-19 education, comprising both academic and vocational qualifications having parity of esteem and providing a level playing field for entry to higher education (Simmons 2009a; Pring et al. 2009; Hodgson and Spours 2010); in turn, this relates to the long-established status distinctions between 'sacred' and 'profane' knowledge which have been analysed

and related to the social division of labour by sociologists such as Émile Durkheim and Basil Bernstein. The practical upshot of such distinctions has been a failure – over many years – to confront some of the implications of the vocational nature of much of the FE sector, leading to a disconnection, or at the very least a significant time lag, between school and vocational teachers in terms of the regulation of recruitment, training and development. As a result, many teachers in the English FE system not only lack initial teaching qualifications, but also have a relatively low level of general education, both in relation to school teachers in England and to vocational teachers in some other countries.

Information on the teaching workforce in FE colleges was provided annually by Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) and then by LSIS; from 2015 it will be provided by the Education and Training Foundation (ETF). Data on the teaching workforce in WBL and ACL has been more sporadic, but valuable information for 2011-12 is available. Even for FE colleges, the analysis of data has been inconsistent in depth and scope, and recent analyses do not include the subject or general educational qualifications held by teachers. However, for 2003-04 the highest qualifications held by teaching staff in FE colleges are shown in Table 2. More recent data on highest qualifications is available for teachers in WBL and ACL, and is shown in Table 3.

Although a requirement for new teachers in FE and the wider education and training sector to undertake initial training has existed since 2001, the preponderance of in-service ITE and the rather lengthy periods of grace associated with the introduction of compulsory qualifications have had a damping effect upon the proportion of staff holding a teaching qualification. In addition, high staff turnover in the WBL sector has meant that many teachers move on before completing a qualification. From Table 4, we see that in spite of two waves of regulation (in 2001 and 2007), less than two-thirds of the FE college workforce is considered to be fully qualified.

Table 2: Highest qualification of FE teaching staff 2003-04
(Higher National Diploma HND, Higher National Certificate HNC, Ordinary National Diploma OND, Ordinary National Certificate ONC, General Certificate of Secondary Education GCSE)

	No. of teaching staff	Percentage
Professional: first degree, further degree and above	65,616	52.0
Higher technical: up to HND/HNC	12,449	9.9
Advanced: up to 2 A-Levels/OND/ONC	11,559	9.2
Intermediate: up to 4 GCSEs (A-C)	5,434	4.3
Foundation: up to 4 GCSEs (D-G)	1,211	1.0
No formal qualifications	2,894	2.3
Not known	27,077	21.4
Total	126,240	100

Source: LLUK (2005)

Table 3: Highest qualification of teaching staff in work-based learning (WBL) and adult and community learning (ACL) (2011-12)

	WBL (%)	ACL (%)
Professional: first degree, further degree and above	26	55.5
Higher technical: Level 5	18	9.3
Higher technical: Level 4	24	18.5
Level 3	24	11.4
Up to/including Level 2	8	5.0
Other	1	0.4

Sources: LSIS (2013b; 2013c)

For ACL and WBL teachers, the data analyses published by LSIS (2013b; 2013c) are difficult to interpret, as they combine teachers holding and working towards a qualification into a single category, and do not distinguish between full qualifications and others (although a full qualification may not be considered appropriate for all teaching staff in these sectors). For what they are worth, these analyses suggest that in 2011-12, 83% of WBL teachers and 84% of ACL teachers held, or were working towards, a teaching qualification. However, analysis of highest overall qualifications in WBL suggests that the actual proportion of qualified staff is much lower than this (BIS 2012a, p.31; see also Table 3, which shows that only 44% of WBL teaching staff hold *any* qualification at level 5 or above).

Table 4: Highest teaching qualification of FE teaching staff (2004-10)

	2003/04 (%)	2006/07 (%)	2009/10 (%)
Full qualification[a]	44.8	49.9	58.8[b]
Partial qualification[c]	16.9	13.9	10.1
Entry level qualification[d]	2.4	2.0	4.5
Other qualification	11.2	8.1	3.8
None	–	5.3	5.1
Not known	20.7	20.7	17.9

Sources: LLUK (2005; 2011)

a PGCE, Cert Ed, BA/BSc with QTS, DTLLS, Level 4 Stage 3 (note that Level 4 Stage 3 would not be considered a full qualification under the 2007 regulations, but as a 'legacy qualification' from the 2001 regulations; holders would not be required to undertake further initial training).
b In 2009/10, a further 5.2% were enrolled on courses leading to a full qualification (BIS 2012a, p.28).
c CTLLS, Level 4 Stage 1 and 2, Level 3 teaching qualification, Learning & Development awards.
d Level 4 (Stage 1 only), PTLLS.

1.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

Although, as discussed above, participation in initial training was voluntary until quite recently, a series of Government reports since the Second World War have aimed to improve or extend FE teacher education. The McNair Report (1944) was particularly significant, leading to the establishment of three specialist colleges of technical teacher training in Bolton (1946), London (1946) and Huddersfield (1947) – later increased to four by the creation of a college in Wolverhampton (1961) following the Crowther Report of 1959. Although most of these reports were concerned to increase the number of trained teachers, they met with considerable reluctance to bear the cost of a radical expansion of training. For example, the Russell report (1966) recommended that new teachers of 15- to18-year-olds should achieve a teaching qualification within three years of taking up their posts; however, largely on financial grounds, the government rejected this proposal, although salary increments and secondments were recommended as incentives to take up the opportunity of teacher training (see Parry 1966 for a discussion of the proposals of the Russell Report and the government response). Lucas (2004a, p.75) argues that the period between the Haycocks reports (1975, 1978) and the early 1990s was marked by a lack of clear Government policy on FE teacher training, leaving a gap which was only partly filled by Regional Advisory Councils[6]. As a result, the proportion of trained teachers showed a marked resistance to change – increasing from 43% in 1975 to just 56% in 1991 *(ibid)*.

De-industrialisation following the economic crises of the 1970s led to fundamental changes in the curriculum of FE and the nature of its students, together with growing intervention by central government and newly-created quangos such as the Manpower Services Commission (MSC). The increasing importance of youth training schemes such as Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP) and Youth Training Scheme (YTS), and greater demand for general education programmes, led to a shift away from evening and day-release programmes for employed students towards courses catering for a more diverse and arguably more challenging cohort. Although marketisation and central state control had been increasing in FE for a number of years (Simmons 2009b; Fisher 2010), the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act is generally recognised as a watershed. The Act removed colleges from local authority control, and established them as quasi-independent organisations in a process known as *incorporation*. A new environment was created in which colleges competed with each other for students and the funding associated with them. As a result, many colleges came under severe financial pressures – often leading to increased class contact hours and additional administrative burdens for teaching staff. In the five-year period following incorporation, 20,000 lecturers were made redundant or took early retirement, whilst student numbers increased by 45% (Beale 2004); significant numbers of part-time and casual staff were recruited to cope with the increased workloads whilst avoiding long-term commitments. Because many of these newly-recruited teachers were not trained, the proportion of staff with teaching qualifications *decreased* in the years following incorporation (Lucas, 2004a: p.86-88).

6 A national network of ten Regional Advisory Councils for Further Education was established in 1946-47 following the Percy Report of 1944. Under the aegis of a National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce set up in 1948 to co-ordinate their work and advise on national policy, the Regional Councils were largely concerned with promoting vocational education in their region – particularly advanced technical education (Dent 1954, pp.136-138).

The 1990s also saw the emergence of teaching qualifications designed to serve a changing curricular landscape. Until then, the main awards had been broadly-based, covering the full teaching role and all forms of curricula. These awards included both the Certificate in Education and PGCE offered by universities and national awarding body qualifications such as the City & Guilds 730. Such qualifications were generally accepted as a basis for continuing professional development (CPD). Teachers were not normally expected to re-train or re-qualify as curriculum developments rendered their initial training outdated. However, the introduction of competence-based National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) was associated with the introduction of a range of specific awards, developed by the Training and Development Lead Body (TDLB) and dealing with NVQ-related training and assessment. Vocational teachers working on these courses were required to gain those awards relevant to their role as trainers or assessors, thus undermining the status of the existing awards and leading to the proliferation of fragmented, competence-based teaching qualifications.

Competence-based approaches also influenced more general teaching qualifications, and many universities re-designed their Cert Ed and PGCE courses to reflect the NVQ framework which many of their trainees were either teaching or hoping to teach. National awarding bodies also changed their teaching qualifications to reflect competence-based awards: for example, the City & Guilds 730 became differentiated into a competence-based route (7306) and a more conventional, knowledge-based route (7307). However, there was considerable opposition to the use of competence-based training as a basis for teaching qualifications, and some trainees found that assessment took precedence over learning in such models (Bruler 2001). Universities in particular were not long in moving away from NVQ-style approaches. However, the formation of the employer-led Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO) in 1999 to implement new occupational standards (the 'FENTO standards') for FE teaching meant that a strong flavour of the competence-based model of training persisted for some time.

Following the Labour election victory in 1997, the notion of lifelong learning acquired a key role in Government policy, leading to an unprecedented and intensive focus on teacher education for the education and training sector, a marked contrast to the earlier 'history of neglect' described by Lucas (2004a). Both the Fryer Report on lifelong learning (Fryer 1997) and the Kennedy Report on widening participation (Kennedy 1997) called for improvements in the quality of teaching and learning, and plans for a national system of compulsory ITE for FE teachers were signalled in the Green Paper *The Learning Age* (DfEE 1998) and set out in the White Paper *Learning to Succeed* (DfEE 1999a). By 2001 the new national standards for FE teachers (FENTO 1999) had been introduced, along with – for the first time in England – a statutory requirement for new teachers to hold a recognised teaching qualification. Under the 2001 regulations (HM Government 2001), teaching qualifications were classified into three stages as follows:

- Stage 3: qualifications of a standard equivalent to a Certificate in Education awarded by a higher education institution;
- Stage 2: qualifications at an intermediate level; in practice this came to mean equivalent to the first year of a two-year part-time Certificate in Education;
- Stage 1: an introductory level qualification.

New appointees to full-time or fractional part-time FE teaching posts were required to obtain a Stage 3 qualification within two years (full-time posts) or four years (part-time posts), whilst other newly-appointed part-time teachers were required to obtain qualifications, also within specified time periods, at a stage considered appropriate by their employer. Occasional teachers, and those teaching exclusively on higher education courses, were not required to obtain a teaching qualification. For an exhaustive study of the debates and processes leading to the 2001 regulations, see Lucas (2004b).

The years following the 2001 reforms saw some tightening of central control over ITE curricula. From September 2001, both university and national awarding body ITE programmes were required to undergo a process of *endorsement* by FENTO. This process consisted of scrutinising course documentation to ensure coverage of the FENTO teaching standards, and to check that courses met certain requirements concerning minimum course hours, assessed teaching observations and quality assurance procedures. The endorsement system also involved visits by reviewers to awarding institutions and delivery centres. By September 2002, FENTO reported that the ITE qualifications of 45 universities and five awarding bodies had been endorsed (Lucas 2004b). Concerns over the literacy and numeracy skills of the adult population, stemming particularly from the Moser Report (DfEE 1999b), led to attempts to strengthen the teaching of these skills in the education and training sector, and from September 2004 awarding institutions were required, as part of the endorsement process, to demonstrate embedding of a new 'minimum core' of literacy, language and numeracy skills in all generic ITE programmes (FENTO 2004). From 2006, embedding had to involve assessment of the minimum core as well as coverage of its content. Indeed, in late 2006 pilot versions were produced of national external tests for the personal skills specified by the minimum core, with a view to establishing analogues to the skills tests associated with ITE for schools. For various reasons, these pilots were soon shelved. For specialist teachers of literacy, numeracy and English for Speakers of other Languages (ESOL) the requirements were more stringent, beginning an identification of these areas as having a sufficiently distinctive 'specialist pedagogy' to warrant separate qualification requirements which continues to the present day. Teachers of literacy and numeracy were to achieve subject-specialist teaching qualifications from September 2002, whilst for their ESOL colleagues the corresponding date was 2003.

As we have already seen in Table 4, the impact of the 2001 reforms was less than might be expected. Although substantial numbers of teachers achieved qualifications or embarked on training courses, by 2004 only 47% of part-time staff and 70% of full-time staff were qualified (LLUK, 2005), compared with 25% and 66% respectively in 1996-97 (Lucas, 2004a: p.87). Training remained dominated by the university awards of Cert Ed and PGCE, and few new teachers embarked upon the national awarding body Stage 3 courses introduced following the 2001 regulations. In 2006-07, only 801 FE college teachers were enrolled on these courses, compared with over 14,000 teachers enrolled on Cert Ed or PGCE courses (LLUK 2008, p.17). Nevertheless, the new century certainly saw an increase in the number of trainees, stimulated not only by the 2001 regulations, but also by growth from teachers in the wider learning and skills sector – including WBL and ACL providers – who now sought recognised teaching qualifications. A major feature of this period was the expansion of teacher training in colleges, through partnership arrangements with universities as well as work with national

awarding bodies. Based initially on 'franchise' arrangements dating back to the 1990s, and later on the 'structured partnerships' between FE colleges and universities encouraged by the Government in *Success for All* (DfES 2002) and *The Future of Higher Education* (DfES 2003), these arrangements meant that in-service Cert Ed and PGCE qualifications were available locally in most parts of the country. In many cases, FE teachers were able to achieve university teaching qualifications within the colleges where they worked, and teachers from work-based learning providers and other local employers could study alongside them.

Following the 2001 regulations, ITE for the sector was therefore still somewhat patchy and uncertain. Although progress had been made, and there was greater acceptance that FE teachers needed to be trained as soon as possible after taking up their posts, the proportion of trained staff was little different from the years before incorporation. In comparison with school teaching, work in FE appeared to be of lower status and lacking a professional identity, albeit with high levels of commitment on the part of individual teachers. In addition, concerns of central government and employers about the quality of training, dating back at least to the mid-1990s (Lucas 2004b, p.37), together with the growing readiness to intervene at a *curriculum* level evident in both Labour and Conservative education policy since the late 1980s, led to a renewed focus on the structure and content of courses. Matters were brought to a head in 2003 when Ofsted, recently given responsibility for inspecting ITE for the education and training sector, produced a survey report which severely criticised existing provision. Although the survey sample omitted some important providers, the report (Ofsted 2003) proved highly influential. Ofsted had found the classroom-based training largely of high quality, but other key areas – notably workplace learning, mentoring and subject-specialist training – came in for particular criticism. The report concluded that: 'The current system of FE teacher training does not provide a satisfactory foundation of professional development for FE teachers at the start of their careers' (Ofsted 2003, p.2). Echoing some of the concerns of academics and teacher educators, Ofsted also criticised the FENTO standards as a framework for initial training (see below).

As a result of concerns about the ability of initial training – and professional development more generally – to produce teachers of sufficient quality for the education and training sector, the Government promised a 'step change' in the quality of ITE for the sector. The nature of this 'step change' was set out in the consultation document *Equipping Our Teachers for the Future* (DfES 2004), which announced a restructuring of teacher education for the education and training sector and effectively introduced a national curriculum for ITE as well as a requirement for all teachers in the sector to engage in continuing professional development (CPD). These reforms[7] comprised three main strands: new teaching standards for the lifelong learning sector; a centrally specified curriculum structure, including a framework of teaching qualifications corresponding to defined teaching roles; and measures to improve workplace learning and partnerships between colleges, universities and other providers. The 2007 system, the degree of impact it had, and its subsequent dismantling by the Coalition Government following the general election of 2010, are discussed in the next two sub-sections.

7 The reforms were to be led, not by FENTO, but by Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK), the newly-established sector skills council for the education and training sector. In January 2005, LLUK took over the work of FENTO in managing the national teaching standards for the further education or lifelong learning sector. Its subsidiary, Standards Verification UK (SVUK), was responsible for the technicalities of endorsement of teaching qualifications.

1.3 THE 2007 REGULATIONS

Aspirations for parity of esteem with school teaching had long been a feature of attempts to reform ITE for the education and training sector, and FENTO had pressed strongly for the introduction of a qualified teacher status, equivalent to QTS in schools. *Equipping Our Teachers* finally accepted these pressures, but announced the introduction of a two-tier system in some ways similar to the distinction between Stage 3 posts and other posts made in the 2001 regulations. However, in the 2007 regulations[8] (HM Government 2007a), the distinction was made, not in terms of full-time/fractional posts against more casual employment, but in terms of the degree of responsibility held by an individual teacher for planning, teaching and assessing their students. Underpinning this distinction was the argument that the amount of teaching undertaken was irrelevant to the quality of training required: students of a teacher employed for only two hours per week had as much right to high-quality tuition as any other students.

Corresponding to the full teaching role, in which the teacher was seen as responsible for a broad range of teaching and associated activities, the reforms introduced the status of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS), to be achieved within five years of entering a full teaching role in the sector. A lower teaching status, Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS), was also introduced. This role, which institutionalised the trend towards limited (and usually lower-paid) posts to support learning or assessment under the supervision of those in a full teaching role, was defined as involving significantly less than the full range of responsibilities ordinarily carried out by a teacher with QTLS, and required a more limited base of knowledge, understanding and application. Unlike the system of ITE for schools, A/QTLS was not awarded on completing an appropriate course; it followed the completion of a period of 'professional formation', a post-qualification process administered by the Institute for Learning (IfL), which required a teacher to demonstrate competence in practice (IfL 2008a). Although introduced with the intention of providing a structured probationary year for newly-qualified teachers, this approach had the unfortunate consequence of undermining the status of the teaching qualifications themselves, and posed an additional barrier to teachers seeking QTLS, as well as requiring an additional administrative layer. Taken together with the normal two-year length of an in-service programme, and the five-year period allowed by the regulations for achieving QTLS, this helps to explain the rather slow penetration of QTLS within the sector – at least amongst staff employed after 2007. Analysis of 2009-10 workforce data showed that of 14,433 teachers who had joined the sector since September 2007, only 5.5% had achieved QTLS or the lower status of ATLS. A similar proportion (5.6%) of teachers who had joined the sector before September 2007 had achieved A/QTLS (BIS 2012a, p.38).

QTLS was subject to annual renewal based on adherence to the IfL Code of Professional Practice (IfL 2008a) together with evidence of appropriate continuing professional development (CPD); a minimum of 30 hours of CPD per year was required, corresponding to the statutory regulations for CPD applying to all FE teachers introduced at the same time as the 2007 regulations on teaching qualifications[9] (HM Government 2007b). Both the award of QTLS and the monitoring of subsequent CPD activity was the responsibility of the Institute for Learning (IfL). Although analogous to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) in schools,

8 The 2007 regulations applied directly only to staff in FE colleges. Staff in WBL and ACL providers were brought under the regulations by means of contractual arrangements for receiving public funding (BIS 2012a, p.10).

9 This included compulsory registration with IfL. See the discussion of the Lingfield review below.

QTLS was initially sector-specific: its possession did not entitle the holder to work in schools as a qualified teacher. Conversely, a school teacher with QTS who transferred to a further education institution was required to achieve QTLS by completing appropriate professional formation, monitored by IfL; a period of two years was allowed for this. It is worth noting here the later introduction by the Coalition government of a statutory equivalence between QTLS and QTS. Under this regulation (HM Government 2012), holders of both QTLS *and* IfL membership became entitled to be employed in schools as qualified teachers, under the same pay and conditions[10] as holders of QTS.

In addition to the status of QTLS, the 2007 reforms included new generic teaching standards (LLUK 2006), new standards for specialist teachers of literacy, numeracy and ESOL (LLUK 2007a; 2007b), and a new qualifications structure aligned with the standards. Unlike the situation with the FENTO standards, awarding institutions were not meant to align their qualifications directly with the new standards. Instead, alignment was indirect, through a menu of mandatory and optional *units of assessment* with specified amounts of academic credit. The units of assessment acted as 'benchmarks for performances in practice of the variety of roles performed by teachers, trainers, tutors and lecturers in the lifelong learning sector' (LLUK 2006: ii). This approach provided a greater degree of central control over curriculum content and assessment, and incidentally caused some consternation to higher education institutions accustomed to working with course modules worth multiples of 10 or 15 credits, and who now faced aligning their programmes with more bite-sized units attracting as little as 3 credits. The main awards contained in the new qualifications framework, and the roles for which they were intended, are described below.

Preparing to teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS)

This was a basic award intended as a minimum requirement for beginning to teach in the education and training sector. According to the 2007 regulations, it was to be achieved within one year of taking up a first teaching post. Effectively, PTLLS was the 'passport to teaching' announced in *Equipping Our Teachers* and envisaged as a short, intensive course requiring around 30 guided learning hours. It was worth 6[11] credits at Level 3 or Level 4 in the National Qualifications Framework (NQF[12]). Although PTLLS was offered by awarding bodies as a stand-alone course, in university Cert Ed and PGCE courses it was normally integrated within the first stage of the award. As well as written assessments, PTLLS required a satisfactory standard of practical teaching, often assessed by means of a 'microteaching' exercise. In its original conception, a new teacher was to achieve PTLLS either before, or very soon after, they began to undertake responsible teaching; this represented a compromise between a desire for at least some pre-service training and pragmatic considerations of labour supply. However, the one-year period allowed to complete PTLLS implied that even this limited compromise would not be achieved.

10 There are some minor differences in conditions of service, for example in relation to induction and appraisal systems.

11 In 2011 the credit rating of PTLLS was increased to 12 (LSIS 2011a).

12 The NQF was later superseded by the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).

Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS)
This qualification was for those in an 'associate' teaching role who aspired to ATLS; it was to be achieved within five years of first employment in the role. Normally worth 24 credits[13] at Level 3 or Level 4 in the NQF, CTLLS required around 120 guided learning hours and the satisfactory completion of assessed teaching practice. A significant difficulty with CTLLS was the disparity between this qualification and those appropriate to QTLS; a teacher holding a CTLLS award still needed to complete a substantial number of further credits, and develop academically to a considerable degree, in order to achieve a qualification appropriate to QTLS. Thompson and Robinson (2008) identified this as a possible barrier to career progression for those in an associate teacher role.

Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS)
This was a full teaching qualification as required for QTLS. The Diploma was worth 120 credits at Level 5 in the NQF, and normally required two years of part-time study. Holders of PTLLS and CTLLS awards could, in certain circumstances, complete DTLLS in a shorter time; those with other awards were sometimes eligible for recognition/accreditation of prior learning (R/APL).

Certificate in Education and PGCE
Under the 2007 regulations, the university awards discussed earlier were recognised as equivalents of DTLLS, and therefore as full teaching qualifications required for QTLS. A Cert Ed is worth 120 credits; following the 2007 reforms this award was in most cases at Level 5 in the NQF but was sometimes higher. Because of changes required by the Bologna Process, after 2005 the PGCE was available at two levels: a *Professional Graduate Certificate* at Level 6, and a *Postgraduate Certificate* at Masters' level (Level 7)[14]. These awards continued to be available as in-service and pre-service routes, normally requiring two years of part-time study or one year full time. Recognition of prior learning (RPL) arrangements often enabled suitably qualified and experienced teachers to complete the in-service programmes in a shorter time. Some universities dropped the traditional award titles in 2007, replacing them with titles that reflected the DTLLS terminology; however, the content and academic levels were similar to those outlined above, whatever terminology was used.

Specialist Diplomas in Literacy, Numeracy and ESOL
In addition to the generic awards, specialist Diplomas were available for literacy, numeracy and ESOL, based on the LLUK standards for these areas (see above) and updating the Level 4 specialist qualifications introduced in 2002-03. These Diplomas, all at Level 5, were offered through a somewhat complex set of arrangements in which they could be integrated (partly or fully) with the corresponding generic ITE awards, or taken as additional Diplomas following completion of a generic award (LLUK 2007c). These specialist Diplomas had specific entry requirements for trainees in terms of relevant subject knowledge at Level 3.

13 In 2011 the credit rating of CTLLS was increased to 36 (LSIS 2011a). At the same time, the required hours of teaching practice for DTLLS were reduced from 150 hours to 100 hours (LSIS 2011b).

14 For a more detailed discussion of the Bologna Process and the academic levels of teaching qualifications, see Appendix 2.

1.4 REGULATION, DE-REGULATION AND BEYOND

As we have seen in Table 4, the 2007 reforms failed to have a dramatic impact before the 2010 general election. Given the three-year time span required to gain an in-service DTLLS, Cert Ed or PGCE and complete professional formation, this was hardly surprising, and the allocation of five years to the process of obtaining QTLS meant that even enrolments on full teaching qualifications proceeded at a relatively leisurely pace. A further obstacle was the shifting of responsibility for funding higher education-based ITE from the state to the individual (Simmons and Thompson 2007), which from September 2006 required trainees to bear a greater share of the cost of their training. Although loans and specific ITE support were available, this new system of funding, allied to a reluctance on the part of many mature trainees to take out student loans, introduced considerable uncertainty into the sector at precisely the time of the 2007 reforms. Based on questionnaire returns from 409 teachers (195 from FE colleges and the remainder from ACL and WBL providers) and follow-up interviews, Lucas and Unwin (2009) found 'a wide range of support, with some FE teachers receiving nothing from the local education authority (LEA) while others had received grants (between £800 and £1200) from their local authorities to cover their course fees'. The financial situation of many trainees was stretched further by significant increases in course fees for university programmes following the Browne Review (2010), and these increases had a devastating effect on recruitment, with many universities experiencing falls in new student numbers of 50% or more. Financial support from employers was equally patchy. Another key plank of the reforms, the role of mentors in providing subject-specialist elements of training, was also hampered by lack of central funding and inconsistent support by employers (Thompson and Robinson 2008).

In spite of the difficulties outlined above, it is likely that – given time – the 2007 reforms would have led to a steady increase both in the proportion of teachers achieving teaching qualifications and in the proportion gaining QTLS status. An evaluation of the reforms conducted by the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills concluded that:

> There is evidence that good progress has been made towards ensuring a qualified and expert teaching profession with new entrants to the sector enrolled on or have achieved a recognised teaching qualification. (BIS 2012a, p.7)

The evaluation report also found improved confidence and aspirations amongst teachers, with a consequent increase in the sense of professionalism of both new and existing teachers. Although the report pointed out that it was too early to expect a significant impact on outcomes for learners, 'the evidence of improvements to teaching suggests that an impact on learners may be evident in the medium to long term future' (BIS 2012a, p.9). However, the report highlighted some negative outcomes from the reforms, including a possible *decrease* in recruitment and retention in the short term due to the increased demands on new staff, the inadequacies in mentoring highlighted above, and a tendency for WBL and ACL employers to 'settle' for PTLLS as a terminal qualification rather than the first step towards full qualification.

A less positive evaluation of successive waves of reform was provided by Lucas et al. (2012), who concluded that the 2007 system was excessively complex and still poorly understood by employers. Quoting one interviewee who described the system as 'a national shambles', Lucas et al. concluded that:

> Our findings show that after a decade of reform, successive standards and regulatory frameworks have not brought about coherence and in many respects have fragmented the system even further. The overwhelming message from those who have had to design ITT programmes in response to quickly changing standards and assessment requirements is that being forced to play a game of complying with external standards and regulations has diverted attention from addressing more fundamental weaknesses such as developing stronger mentoring support and achieving a better synergy between the taught and practice elements of courses. (Lucas et al. 2012, pp.693-694)

There was mixed evidence, then, about how the new system was working. However, the global economic recession which began in 2008 and the formation of a Conservative–Liberal Democrat Coalition government following the general election of 2010 created a markedly different political environment from the context of the 2001 and 2007 regulations. Austerity and de-regulation provided the climate for a sceptical review of the complex bureaucracy associated with ITE for the education and training sector, and the central assumptions of the New Labour approach – that a national, regulated system of professional development was necessary if improvements to learning were to occur – were replaced by a more market-driven philosophy. Within the Coalition approach, the role of the state would become more enabling than regulatory, and providers in the education and training sector were to be given the freedom to innovate and experiment. The underpinning logic was that the market would decide – that learners and their actual or potential employers would seek out those providers with the most effective systems of professional development for their teachers.

The so-called 'bonfire of the quangos' did not pass by the education and training sector. In December 2010, the UK Commission on Employment and Skills (UKCES) advised ministers not to renew the licence of LLUK as a Sector Skills Council, on the basis that its responsibilities would be incompatible with the resources available (BIS 2010). From April 2011, some of these responsibilities – for the endorsement of qualifications, mapping legacy and non-FE qualifications against the 2007 qualifications system, and maintaining a register of approved qualifications – were transferred to IfL, whilst others, notably responsibility for standards and the structure of qualifications, passed to the Learning and Skills Improvement Service (LSIS). IfL was already, under changes announced by the previous Labour government in 2009, due to lose government funding in 2011, and – as we will see below – LSIS itself was to close in August 2013. Meanwhile, more fundamental changes were underway, arising in part from an industrial dispute over the payment of teachers' subscriptions to IfL, which had in the past been government-funded; and also from wider government concerns over the continuing relevance of the 2007 regulations. In September 2011, the government announced the formation of a panel, formally launched in February 2012 under the chairmanship of Lord Lingfield, to review 'the current arrangements to regulate and facilitate the professionalism of the FE and Skills workforce' (BIS 2012b). The panel reported its findings in two stages: an interim report in March 2012, dealing with pressing

matters of regulation and qualifications (BIS 2012c), and a final report in October 2012 concerned with wider issues of professionalism in the sector (BIS 2012d).

There is a notable difference between the conclusions of the BIS evaluation report (BIS 2012a) and the Lingfield interim report, both published in the same month. As we have seen, the BIS evaluation was cautiously optimistic, and drew attention to the inevitable time lag between the introduction of the 2007 regulations and any possible dramatic impact. The Lingfield interim report, by contrast, was scathing in its criticism of the reforms – asserting that IfL had not won the confidence of the sector, that the regulations had alienated teachers and their employers, that the impact on the proportion of qualified teachers had been slight, and that QTLS had little credibility as a licence to practise (BIS 2012c, pp.4-5). Even the titles of awards did not escape censure, and the tendency of the sector to use what Lingfield called 'inappropriate' informal references to 'petals, kettles and dettles' was highlighted.

There is no doubt that some of these criticisms were justified. In particular, the report rightly identified the unhelpful impact of the distinction between 'full' and 'associate' teaching roles and the over-complicated nature of the qualifications system. However, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the report found precisely what it intended to find, and that the outcome had been largely pre-determined – not least because, as Lingfield pointed out, the infrastructure supporting the 2007 regulations was already being largely dismantled. The recommendations of the interim report had therefore an air of inevitability, and included revocation of the 2007 regulations from Ist September 2012; confirmation that state funding for IfL would end, with a concomitant transfer of responsibility for supporting professionalism to LSIS; and simplification and renaming of initial teaching qualifications. In the event, a government consultation on the proposal to revoke the 2007 regulations produced an overwhelming majority in favour of retaining some form of regulation, at least until other changes in the sector had taken effect. Although the government maintained its support for Lingfield, arguing that the response to the consultation was in contradiction to the reality that 40% of teachers had not complied with the requirement to register with IfL, it announced that revocation would be staged. The CPD regulations (HM Government 2007b) would be revoked as originally planned from September 2012, but the qualification regulations would be retained until the end of the academic year 2012-13 (BIS 2012e). LSIS, as a matter of urgency, would develop a new qualifications structure to replace the 2007 framework; however, although the qualifications themselves would be part of a national system, it would be for individual teachers and employers to decide what qualifications, if any, would be acquired. It is this framework of qualifications which is discussed in the overview of routes through initial teacher education in Section 2 of this report.

The final Lingfield report (BIS 2012d) was broader, being largely concerned with the nature of FE professionalism and how it might be supported along the fairly limited lines envisaged by the panel (which were consistent with developing ideas in government circles about teaching as a craft rather than a knowledge-based profession). Lingfield welcomed the government's earlier proposal to establish an employer-led 'guild' for further education – another craft-based reference – and the announcement by John Hayes, then Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning, to proceed with establishing the guild following the consultation on the interim report (BIS 2012e, p.5). The main priorities for the guild would be professional standards and workforce development, vocational

education and training, leadership, management and governance, and research and innovation. When this body finally emerged in August 2013, renamed the Education and Training Foundation, it took its place within a fundamentally altered landscape, one in which 'teachers and trainers in this sector are not required to join a professional body for teachers/trainers, achieve specific teaching qualifications, meet any minimum standards of performance, or fulfil CPD requirements beyond those specified by their employer and/or through their contract of employment' (ETF 2014b, p.4). Within this new landscape, the position of the Institute for Learning was clearly untenable. In July 2014 the IfL board announced its recommendation that IfL should close and that its legacy and assets should be passed to the Education and Training Foundation (ETF). This decision was ratified by IfL's elected Advisory Council on 17 July 2014. At the time of writing, it is intended that IfL will remain open and continue to operate as a professional body until the transfer of its legacy has been completed, in autumn 2014.

SECTION 2 AN OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ROUTES THROUGH ITE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

Although a standardised national system of initial teaching qualifications exists in England, there is a wide variety of routes through this system. Procedures for RPL provide the possibility of transfer between these routes, and may also enable teachers or trainers with qualifications developed for other purposes to join the standard routes at an appropriate point. It should also be remembered that many teachers in the sector will have teaching qualifications from earlier systems, for example those based on the teaching standards introduced in 2007 (LLUK 2006) or on the earlier FENTO[15] standards (FENTO 1999).

The various routes can be analysed in terms of a series of dichotomies, as follows:

1. *Pre-service or in-service?*
   As noted above, achieving a teaching qualification before taking up a teaching post has never been a requirement in the education and training sector, and most employers are willing to recruit teaching staff directly from their previous occupation outside teaching. Indeed, in-service training is the norm in the sector, and it has been estimated that some 90% of those teachers undertaking training do so via in-service programmes (IfL 2011). However, this does not mean that the overwhelming majority of trainees are in paid teaching employment. Increasingly, trainees use voluntary employment as a means of accessing in-service programmes; although in some cases these are people with established teaching roles in voluntary organisations, it is now common for potential trainees either to seek or be offered 'teaching placements', perhaps in the colleges where they are training. Furthermore, increased pressure to achieve qualifications soon after taking up employment (a pressure based on statutory requirements between 2001 and 2013) means that many in-service trainees are new teachers. The distinction between pre-service and in-service programmes, once quite sharp, has therefore blurred to a significant extent in recent years. For some pre-service trainees in priority subject areas[16], bursaries of up to £20,000 are available (BIS 2014).

2. *Full-time or part-time?*
   A major distinction between pre-service and in-service trainees is that the majority of avowedly pre-service trainees are following full-time programmes. However, part-time pre-service programmes do exist, allowing intending teachers to become qualified whilst remaining in their primary occupation. By their nature, in-service programmes are part-time: although in principle employed teachers could be given sabbatical leave to attend a full-time programme, such an approach would be very unusual.

3. *Full or partial qualification?*
   Although the notion of 'full' qualification is no longer based on statutory regulations, it remains useful to distinguish qualifications on the basis of their level and credit rating. In this sense, a 'full' qualification means one which

15 Further Education National Training Organisation.

16 In 2014-15 these are mathematics, English and Special Educational Needs.

is at Level 5 or above in the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF), or the equivalent level in higher education, contains at least 120 credits, and conforms to the LSIS guidance on Level 5 Diploma qualifications (LSIS 2013d; 2013e). This guidance includes requirements for at least 100 hours of supervised practical teaching in appropriate contexts, eight assessed teaching observations, and appropriate coverage of a 'minimum core' of knowledge for language, literacy, numeracy and ICT (LSIS 2013f). The term also refers to qualifications from earlier systems which were regarded as full qualifications. Partial qualifications refer to other relevant awards at a lower level, contain less credit, or are not accepted as equivalents under earlier systems.

In the current system, examples of full qualifications are the Level 5 Diploma in Education and Training, and the university awards of Certificate in Education and PGCE. Full qualifications from earlier systems include the Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS) and the City & Guilds 7407 Stage 3. Partial qualifications include the current Level 3 Award in Education and Training[17], the Level 4 Certificate in Education and Training, and the now-discontinued Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS). The minimum core must be covered in the Level 4 Certificate. Although there are no formal requirements for demonstrating achievement in literacy and numeracy other than the development required by the minimum core, all the current awards require an initial assessment of trainees' personal skills in English, mathematics and ICT.

A full qualification gives access to QTLS status, not immediately on qualification as occurs in school ITE, but following a period of professional formation administered by the IfL[18] (IfL 2014). Some partial qualifications give access to the status of Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) (IfL 2014). All applicants for QTLS or ATLS are required to demonstrate achievement of Level 2 personal skills in literacy and numeracy.

4. *Generic or specialist qualification?*
   A generic qualification is one which does not have a specific subject focus or title, although it may contain requirements that trainees develop their subject knowledge and pedagogy and will have arrangements for trainees to work with a subject-specialist mentor. The examples of full and partial qualifications given above are all generic in nature. A specialist qualification is one which has a specific subject focus, and it will normally be named accordingly. In the education and training sector, specialist qualifications are mainly those associated with areas identified by the *Skills for Life* policies of the early New Labour governments – English (literacy), English (ESOL) and mathematics (numeracy) – and the more recent qualifications introduced to improve the teaching of learners with disabilities. For an overview of these specialist qualifications, see LSIS (2013d).

5. *Awarding organisation or university programmes?*
   The final distinction to be made here is between the institutions responsible for developing and awarding teaching qualifications. There is a long tradition of teaching qualifications being offered by national

17 Strictly speaking, this is not a qualification but an introductory award.

18 How the closure of IfL will affect the operation of QTLS is not yet clear.

awarding bodies such as City & Guilds, for delivery by FE colleges and other organisations within the education and training sector. According to the Ofqual *Register of Regulated Qualifications*, in March 2014 there were twelve awarding organisations offering the Diploma in Education and Training discussed below. The university awards of Certificate in Education and PGCE[19] are also long-established teaching qualifications[20]. In addition to being delivered on-campus by university staff, many universities have arrangements for collaborative provision in which their awards are also delivered in FE colleges (and sometimes in other institutions), by staff employed by these institutions. Although this may involve colleges designing their own awards and having them validated by a university, a more common arrangement is for the university to design the curriculum, and then to validate partner institutions for delivery on a franchise basis. Some universities have extensive networks of partner colleges, and across a network, cohorts of 1,000 or more students all working for the same award, are possible. Universities offering PGCE or Certificate in Education programmes are likely to be members of the Post-16 Committee of the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET).

A brief description of each of the major awards in the current qualification system is given below, followed by examples of some legacy qualifications that may also be encountered.

Postgraduate/Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

As already noted, these two variants of the well-known PGCE are full teaching qualifications awarded by a university. Broadly speaking, PGCE courses are aimed at graduates, and provide a broadly-based programme of initial teacher education which combines the development of practical skills with academic study of post-compulsory education. However, entry requirements and award regulations can vary; for example, some universities allow non-graduates meeting appropriate academic standards to be awarded a PGCE. Where the PGCE is entirely at Level 6, it is entitled the Professional Graduate Certificate in Education. A PGCE containing 60 credits at Level 7 will normally have the title Postgraduate Certificate in Education. Some universities have developed a Postgraduate Diploma in Education, which contains 120 credits at Level 7. Although university qualifications must cover mandatory core content (LSIS 2013e), their curriculum is developed and validated by the particular universities offering each award. The structure and content of these awards can therefore differ significantly from those of awarding organisations; however, they will always contain equivalent elements to the compulsory parts of the QCF qualifications.

Certificate in Education

The Certificate in Education (Cert Ed) is a full teaching qualification at Level 5, awarded by a university but aimed at non-graduates. Typical entry requirements include Level 3 or Level 4 qualifications in the subject being taught; Level 2 personal skills in literacy and numeracy may also be required. In most cases, the curriculum will be similar to the PGCE and both cohorts of students may be taught together, differentiation between the cohorts taking place through outcome rather than through content. In some universities, transfer between Cert Ed and PGCE

19 The PGCE is offered in two variants: the Professional Graduate Certificate in Education at Level 6 and the Postgraduate Certificate in Education at Level 7. See below and Appendix 2 for a discussion of these variants.

20 For a comparison of the perceptions of trainees and teacher educators between awarding organisation and university awards, see Simmons and Walker (2013).

is possible; in other cases, Cert Ed students may have the opportunity to study at Level 6. For many years, the Cert Ed was regarded as the 'benchmark' qualification for the education and training sector, and in the 2001 workforce regulations the Cert Ed was used to define the full teaching qualification as then recognised.

Level 5 Diploma in Education and Training (QCF)

This is a full qualification, suitable for both pre-service and in-service trainees, and is offered by awarding organisations. Although some university awards may have similar titles[21], the Diploma is part of the Qualifications and Credit Framework administered by Ofqual, rather than a university validated qualification. Its purpose is described by LSIS as preparing trainees to teach in a range of contexts, and to undertake teaching and/or training responsibilities (LSIS 2013d, p.8). The Diploma is formally recognised as equivalent to a university Certificate in Education. A Level 5 Diploma programme is assembled from a menu of compulsory and optional units; full details of the structure of this qualification may be found in LSIS (2013d).

Level 5 Specialist Diplomas

A number of specialist qualifications are available for teachers of literacy, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), numeracy and disabled learners. These are offered in three distinct forms: as specialist pathways within a generic qualification; as specialist diplomas in which the specialist elements are fully integrated within the programme[22]; and as standalone diplomas taken after completion of a generic full teaching qualification. In total, there are fifteen of these specialist routes, five in each group, all of which[23] provide full qualification as a specialist teacher of the relevant area. A description of the specialist qualifications may be found in LSIS (2013d).

Level 4 Certificate in Education and Training (QCF)

This is a partial qualification, offered by awarding organisations and suitable for both pre-service and in-service trainees. It prepares trainees to teach in a wide range of contexts (LSIS 2013g, p.7). It contains 36 credits, of which at least 21 must be at Level 4 or above, and requires 30 hours of practical teaching and three assessed teaching observations. It will be evident that there is a substantial difference in the requirements for the Level 4 Certificate and the Level 5 Diploma, making progression between them difficult to achieve without increasing the required length of study. This situation is similar to the disparity between the earlier CTLLS and DTLLS qualifications, which was widely regarded as a retrograde step from qualifications introduced in 2001 in which the lower-level qualification allowed direct progression to the final year of the full qualification. University programmes may offer equivalents to the Level 4 Certificate as exit awards to trainees unable to complete the full qualification.

21 Since the introduction of the 2007 workforce regulations, some universities have changed the title of their PGCE and Cert Ed programmes to reflect the current QCF qualifications. However, curriculum content and award regulations do not differ significantly from programmes that have retained the traditional titles.

22 Essentially, this means that all 100 hours of practice and all eight teaching observations are in the relevant specialist context.

23 This assumes that teachers undertaking the standalone diplomas already hold a full generic qualification.

Level 3 Award in Education and Training (QCF)
The Level 3 award is offered by awarding organisations, although universities may embed it in their programmes. The award is suitable for both pre-service and in-service trainees, and contains 12 credits. It provides an introduction to teaching and is particularly valuable for those with no previous teaching experience (LSIS 2013h, p.6).

For further details on the structure of the current system of qualifications, including a 'trainees' eye' view of the suitability of each award for people at different stages of their teaching career or in different roles, see LSIS (2013i).

It will by now be clear that the potential combinations of qualifications and routes through ITE for the education and training sector are complex and numerous, particularly because RPL arrangements mean that trainees can transfer several times between routes before achieving full qualification. Some assistance in navigating this complex terrain was provided by the ITT/E Register, a list of ITE qualifications offered in the education and training sector; however, this has not been maintained for some time and at the time of writing appears to be offline. An alternative to this register is provided by the Talent website, www.talent.ac.uk/courses.asp, which can also be accessed from the FE Advice website maintained by the Education and Training Foundation, www.feadvice.org.uk/next-steps/where-can-you-train.

Diagrams showing the current qualification routes for teaching in the education and training sector and, for purposes of comparison, the routes in the 2007 system of qualifications, are provided in Figures 1 and 2.



Figure 1: Routes through Initial Teacher Education for the education and training sector in England in 2014



Figure 2: The 2007 system of Initial Teacher Education qualifications for the Lifelong Learning Sector in England

SECTION 3 ITE ROUTES AND SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY

This part of the report provides an assessment of the potential of different ITE routes within the education and training sector for enhancing the subject teaching skills of beginning teachers. Subject-specialist pedagogy, particularly within vocational subject areas, has been a concern in the sector for many years, and is particularly associated with a highly critical Ofsted report on ITE for further education; this identified training in subject-specialist teaching as a key area requiring improvement (Ofsted 2003). At around the same time, the Skills for Life agenda, prompted by concerns over adult literacy and numeracy arising from the Moser report (DfEE 1999a), led to a focus on subject-specialist training in these areas and also in ESOL. More recently, increasing interest in the notion of vocational pedagogy (CAVTL 2013; Orr and Robinson 2013) has also stimulated awareness of the importance of distinguishing specialist from generic knowledge and skills, and developing appropriate understanding of both these aspects in trainee teachers. Section 3 begins by reviewing the nature of concerns over subject-specialist training. It goes on to analyse the notion of pedagogy and how it has come to be interpreted in both a specialist and a generic sense; the relationship between knowledge and pedagogy is also discussed, followed by a critical review of conceptions of subject-specialist pedagogy, particularly in vocational education. These general analyses are then applied to the question of how effectively subject-specialist pedagogy might be developed in the context of the main routes through ITE for the education and training sector.

Before proceeding, the term 'pedagogy' requires further elaboration, partly because of its somewhat elusive nature but also because of the controversy it sometimes excites:

> A robust vocational teaching and learning system must be underpinned by a serious focus on vocational pedagogy. And yet, as we have gone round the country visiting sites of vocational teaching and learning and in our seminars, of all the terms we have discussed the one that gets people most agitated is 'pedagogy'. (CAVTL 2013, p.13)

Pedagogy is indeed contested territory, particularly in the education and training sector. In part, this is due to its etymology, which suggests that the term is more appropriate for teachers of younger students. More broadly, the idea of pedagogy as something akin to a science of teaching evokes controversies over the status of education as a discipline and the role of 'theory' in ITE. Such controversies make it important to begin with a definition; in the ensuing discussion, we will follow Bernstein (2000) in conceptualising pedagogy as a process about which it is possible to have knowledge, rather than as a body of knowledge in itself. Bernstein's definition is deliberately broad, encompassing a wide range of settings and relationships which may frame the acquisition of knowledge, values and behaviour:

> Pedagogy is a sustained process whereby somebody(s) acquires new forms or develops existing forms of conduct, knowledge, practice and criteria from somebody(s) or something deemed to be an appropriate provider and evaluator. … We can distinguish between institutional pedagogy and segmented (informal) pedagogy.

> Institutional pedagogy is carried out in official sites … usually with accredited providers. … Segmental pedagogy is carried out usually in the face-to-face relations of everyday experience and practice by informal providers. (Bernstein 2000, p.78)

By the term segmental pedagogy, Bernstein refers to a process which develops competence in a repertoire of strategies designed to deal with a specific and well-defined context. Institutional pedagogies[24], on the other hand, are concerned with the acquisition of 'specialised symbolic structures of explicit knowledge' (Bernstein 2000, p.160). The distinction between the forms of knowledge and behaviour associated with these different types of pedagogy is discussed in section 3.2 below. Pedagogies may be explicit, implicit (in which the pedagogic process is less visible, but still intentional) or tacit (in which learning occurs without intention, for example through unintended modelling), and are underpinned by socially constructed rules or principles governing how content is to be distributed, contextualised and evaluated. For Bernstein, pedagogy can therefore exist in various modalities or forms of arrangement of the relationships and practices involved in the process of acquisition[25]. Pedagogic knowledge in general can therefore be thought of as knowledge about the possible forms of these modalities, the conditions under which they may apply, and the consequences they may have. The extent to which this pedagogical knowledge can have a subject-specialist dimension, and the effectiveness of ITE in this respect, form the focus of the following sub-sections.

3.1 IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM: DEFICIENCIES IN SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY

Concerns over the subject-specialist knowledge of teachers are by no means new, nor confined to the education and training sector. Poulson (2001) traces the development over many years of research into teachers' subject-specific knowledge, conceptualised as including both subject knowledge as such, and knowledge about the pedagogical application of subject knowledge. She notes in particular the influential work of Lee Shulman (1986; 1987), which promoted the view that subject knowledge for teaching, or what Shulman called *pedagogical content knowledge*, was (or should be) a distinctive part of the teacher's knowledge base. Shulman (1986) argued that developing generic pedagogical knowledge alone was not a sufficient preparation for teaching. In his view, the distinctive nature of subject teaching lay in a characteristic knowledge base at the intersection of content and pedagogy[26].

> Within the category of pedagogical content knowledge I include, for the most regularly taught topics in one's subject area, the most useful form of representations of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations – in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others …

24 This is not to say that these are the *only* pedagogies encountered in educational institutions.

25 Some authors distinguish between conceptualisations of pedagogy based on metaphors of learning as acquisition or as participation (Sfard 1998). Bernstein would not make the distinction in this way, but would consider participative approaches as one of the modalities through which pedagogy is enacted.

26 Lock et al. (2011) point out that, in spite of its usefulness in models of subject knowledge for teaching, Shulman's work is not well-known and explicit reference to pedagogical content knowledge is absent from official guidance in England.

> Pedagogical content knowledge also includes an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them to the learning of those most frequently taught topics and lessons. If those preconceptions are misconceptions, which they so often are, teachers need knowledge of the strategies most likely to be fruitful in reorganising the understanding of learners … (Shulman 1986, pp. 9-10)

Shulman and his colleagues tended to assume that strongly-developed content knowledge could be taken for granted; however, as Poulson (2001) points out, this is not necessarily the case – particularly in sectors where teachers are unlikely to be fully expert in the disciplinary knowledge they draw on. In Poulson's case, this is the primary school sector, where the requirement to teach a wide range of subjects reduces the chances of the teacher having a secure and up-to-date knowledge in all of them. However, the point also applies, in a different way, to the education and training sector. As section 1.1 indicates, trainee teachers in this sector often have subject qualifications below degree level and a significant proportion have only Level 3 subject qualifications; although they may be highly expert vocational practitioners, they do not necessarily possess this expertise in terms of formal propositional knowledge, or have confidence in drawing on the range of disciplinary knowledge required by a vocational area. Moreover, the enormous range of specialisms in the education and training sector makes the development of subject-specific pedagogy logistically as well as conceptually difficult (Fisher and Webb 2006, p.341).

What might be seen as complacency in relation to subject pedagogy is illustrated by the preamble to the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO) standards, the first set of national teaching standards developed for the education and training sector:

> The standards are based on the assumption that those who teach in the sector already possess specialised subject knowledge, skills and experience. The standards, therefore, address the professional development of teachers and teaching teams rather than the development of their subject expertise. (FENTO 1999, p.3)

Although the development of teachers' subject knowledge, and their ability to select, recontextualise and interpret subject content were represented in the FENTO standards, the underlying message was that this was something teachers could be relied upon to do, as expert practitioners. Where professional knowledge about teaching a specific subject was required, this would flow naturally from the combination of subject expertise and generic pedagogy. Such assumptions were flatly contradicted when Ofsted was given responsibility for the inspection of ITE for further education in 2001. Coming from a largely schools-based perspective, where subject-specialist arrangements for training were much more common, Ofsted perceived the models of ITE they encountered in further education to contain significant weaknesses. In a survey inspection of a sample of providers conducted in 2002-03, Ofsted highlighted deficiencies in the development of both subject knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. The specific criticisms of subject pedagogy contained in the Ofsted report may be summarised by a single paragraph within it:

> None of the formal training includes provision to help trainees improve their subject knowledge or their vocational competence. There is also little opportunity for trainees to develop subject-specific pedagogy which would enable them to understand and practise the particular skills relevant to teaching their specialist area. In some cases, subject-specific mentors are available to give advice and guidance, and trainees greatly value the contributions made by these work-based staff. However, benefiting from this informal element of training is often a matter of chance … (Ofsted 2003, pp.20-21)

In other words, both subject knowledge *per se* and pedagogical content knowledge were neglected, with advice on pedagogy being largely generic. Although Ofsted found that the quality of the generic training led by teacher educators was generally good, nevertheless 'The quality of the trainees' teaching is affected adversely by their limited knowledge of how to teach their subject' (Ofsted 2003, p.4).

As might be expected, these criticisms led to a flurry of activity within the sector, particularly in relation to subject-specific mentoring. Some providers also strengthened the subject-specific content of the formal aspects of their programmes, and blended learning approaches were developed to overcome the logistical problems of constituting viable subject-specialist groups in such a diverse sector (Fisher and Webb 2006). The 2007 teaching standards (LLUK 2006) contained a complete 'domain' concerned with specialist learning and teaching, providing a greater focus on pedagogical content knowledge than the FENTO standards. However, in spite of these improvements, progress was slow, and a review based on the 2004-08 inspection cycle noted that variability in the quality of subject-specialist support remained problematic (Ofsted 2009). If anything, subject-specific teaching has become more of an issue across all sectors as expectations have risen, particularly for teachers working beyond the confines of a single academic discipline (see, for example, Finegold 2012).

3.2 WHAT IS SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY?

Both Shulman's analysis of pedagogical content knowledge and the standpoint from which Ofsted evaluated subject-specialist provision in ITE have been criticised for embodying objectivist assumptions about knowledge in general (Nasta 2007; Maxwell 2010). The strongly context-dependent nature of teaching in the education and training sector is emphasised by Hodkinson and James (2003, p.401): 'what works, or is deemed good practice in one learning site may not work or be good practice in another'. This undermines the assumption made by Shulman, that there may be an agreed body of knowledge concerning the ways in which key concepts in a subject can be represented or explained, and that all learners behave and develop in similar and essentially predictable ways – or indeed, that trainee teachers will develop along equally predictable lines. Instead, the emphasis shifts from the codification and transmission of objective knowledge to the construction of knowledge within specific contexts as socially-situated individuals grapple with the particular problems they face: 'learning to teach is a "situated process" that takes place in and between contexts … in taking this approach I highlight the importance of seeing learning as a social process and that the basis for analysing learning should be the "community of practice" ' (Lucas 2007, p.98).

It is, of course, important to recognise the situated nature of learning and the difficulty – even undesirability, in certain situations – of separating knowledge from the context in which it is produced and acquired. Moreover, the concept of 'learning cultures' which arise from the social and historical processes shaping a particular learning site enables us to recognise the ways in which external power and inequalities can penetrate the site, affecting how and why people learn (James and Biesta 2007). These generic aspects of understanding how pedagogies emerge in educational settings must be considered alongside more subject-specific aspects. Nevertheless, two points should be made in relation to seeing the work-based learning of teachers as a social process situated within particular contexts and communities of practice. Firstly, in the education and training sector, communities of practice are often weakly developed: many teachers may work in isolation or with little support, and even where distinctive learning cultures exist, ideas about teaching may be formed more from external influences than from within the community (Orr 2009). Indeed, as Fuller and Unwin (2003) have observed, the modern workplace is often inimical to the kind of gradual induction into a community of practice assumed by the model of transition from periphery to core associated with Lave and Wenger (1991), so that 'restrictive' rather than 'expansive' workplace learning is likely to be the norm in some organisational contexts.

Secondly, recognising that learning is a social process does not preclude the importance and value of propositional knowledge or formal theory; arguably, teachers need access to knowledge which is not tied to particular contexts in order to understand and evaluate the practices embedded in their particular setting. However, conceptualising knowledge in social terms highlights the problem of *recontextualisation* (Bernstein 2000, pp.32-33). In other words, what elements of knowledge and theory are to be selected for relocation in a specific pedagogical context, according to what principles of organisation, and how and for whom is the new pedagogic context to be constituted? In the case of ITE, this involves deciding what elements of formal knowledge and theory are to be made available to particular cohorts of trainees, how situated learning processes are to be supported and recognised, and how the two are to be related. As we will discuss later, the issue of recontextualisation is an important one: the nature of subject-specialist pedagogies in the context of ITE is not just a question of what kinds of subject-specialist knowledge exist, but also of whether and how they are made available in ITE curricula.

3.2.1 Subject-specific pedagogical knowledge

As noted above, a useful starting point for characterising the knowledge structures that might underpin subject-specialist pedagogy is provided by Shulman's conception of the knowledge base of teachers (Shulman, 1986; 1987). Shulman (1987, p.8) identifies (at least) seven categories of teacher knowledge:

- Content knowledge – that is, subject knowledge *per se*.
- General pedagogical knowledge – the broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organisation which appear to transcend subject matter.
- Curriculum knowledge – knowledge of the ways in which subject content is made available through educational curricula, including syllabuses, learning resources and assessment strategies.

- Knowledge of learners and their characteristics.
- Knowledge of educational contexts, both at the micro (classroom) and meso/macro (communities and cultures) levels.
- Knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.
- Pedagogical content knowledge.

According to Shulman, pedagogical content knowledge brings together these aspects, interpreting them in the context of a specific curriculum subject: 'It represents the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organised, represented and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners. … Pedagogical content knowledge is the category most likely to distinguish the understanding of the content specialist …' (Shulman 1987, p.8). Lucas (2007) places considerable emphasis on the contextual dependence of most of these categories, and emphasises the potential of social theories of learning for understanding how pedagogical content knowledge emerges from the formal training *and* workplace experience of novice teachers. Indeed, as Lucas notes, Shulman later modified his ideas to achieve a broader conception of how teachers learn and develop in the communities and contexts where they are located.

A model of subject knowledge for teaching developed by the Training and Development Agency for Schools draws on Shulman's ideas (TDA 2007). This model distinguishes three core areas: subject knowledge *per se*; pedagogy (conceptualised as both an understanding of the teaching skills and strategies needed to teach the subject effectively *and* the ability to apply them in practice); and knowledge about learners' cognitive development in the subject. Surrounding these core areas is an affective component: the teacher's subject-related attitudes and beliefs, including their enthusiasm for the subject, and their commitment to learners' achievement within it (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: A model of subject knowledge for teaching (adapted from TDA 2007)

Although this model is similar in many ways to Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge, the introduction of an affective dimension is a significant difference, and its conceptualisation of knowledge about how students learn a subject is potentially broader. To avoid confusion with pedagogy as practice or with Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge, the conception of pedagogical content knowledge represented by this model will be referred to as *subject-specific pedagogical knowledge*. It corresponds to the 2007 LLUK standards and the inspection methodology employed by Ofsted, both of which emphasise affective as well as cognitive dimensions to subject teaching. By contrast, the 2014 teaching standards (ETF 2014b) also value 'enthusiasm' for one's subject and the need to develop one's own subject knowledge, but frame pedagogical knowledge largely in generic terms. The term *subject-specialist pedagogy* will be used to refer both to subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and to the application of this knowledge in pedagogy as a set of practices.

The organisation of this model receives some empirical support from a small-scale study of teacher knowledge based on eight in-service trainees (Maxwell 2010). These trainees appeared to draw on three types of 'knowledge resource': subject and vocational knowledge; generic learning and teaching knowledge acquired through their ITE courses and their workplace experience; and knowledge 'constructed with and about learning groups and individual learners' (p.343). In addition to these knowledge resources, Maxwell found that trainees' beliefs, values and prior experiences were a strong influence on their propensity to engage with and developing their knowledge base, as well as prior experience being sometimes a source of knowledge in its own right.

3.2.2 Subjects and curriculum knowledge in education and training

The model of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge outlined above raises a number of questions of particular importance in the context of ITE for the education and training sector.

- What constitutes a 'subject'?
- What kinds of knowledge are present in the subjects and curricula commonly encountered in the education and training sector?
- What are the possible pedagogical modalities in ITE for developing subject-specific pedagogical knowledge?

Crawley (2005) suggests that a single college of further education may have up to 200 subject specialisms, a reflection of differences in the way that knowledge is valued, represented and used between schools and vocational education. In schools, subjects are limited in number, and compete for space with other subjects on the basis of broader societal evaluations of their function in socialisation as well as their disciplinary function. A school subject, of course, is not the same as an academic discipline: it is a subset of disciplinary content, selected and recontextualised for broader educational purposes, which include but are not restricted to preparing young people for further study in the subject. Nevertheless, in the current English school system there is a reasonably close correspondence between the majority of school subjects and a small number of key academic disciplines. Bernstein (2000, p.52) describes these disciplines as singulars: knowledge structures having a specialised discrete discourse with their own texts, practices, modes of assessment, and routes of progression. Singulars – for example, physics, chemistry and history –

are protected by strong boundaries and hierarchies, making them easy to recognise as definite and separate entities.

By contrast, although subjects reflecting academic disciplines do exist in the education and training sector, many 'subjects' encountered in FE colleges would be described by Bernstein as regions: larger units, formed by drawing on and recontextualising selected singulars, which operate in the field of vocational practice – for example, engineering, business studies, and media studies. Young (2008) expresses the distinction between singulars and regions in terms of principles of insularity and hybridity, arguing that hybridity 'rejects the claim that the boundaries and classifications between subjects and disciplines reflect features of knowledge itself, and sees them as always a product of particular historical circumstances and interests' (p.87). In Young's view, curricula based on a principle of hybridity can help to overcome the traditional 'boundedness' of school or academic knowledge (p.37). One such principle for integrating disciplines can be found in the idea of a 'direct line of sight to work' which permeates the CAVTL report (CAVTL 2013; see below).

The multiplicity of ways in which singulars can be selected and combined not only generates a large number of 'vocational subjects', but also calls into question the integrity and distinctiveness of the subject-specific pedagogical knowledge within regions. Fisher and Webb (2006) argue that epistemological changes associated with the rise of postmodernism, and the rise of performativity in educational institutions, have intensified moves towards interdisciplinarity and regionalisation in the education and training sector, further undermining the basis of notions of highly specific subject pedagogies. Similar arguments are proposed by Lucas (2007), who sees the 'new FE' of the twenty-first century as placing greater emphasis on generic aspects of learning and the ability to work in multi-specialist teams than on traditional subject boundaries. Indeed, although teachers of vocational subjects would benefit from aspects of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge associated with relevant singulars – for example, hairdressing tutors could be helped by knowledge of how learning and teaching take place in relation to capillary action – consideration of the singular/regional distinction suggests that the similarities between vocational subjects may be as great as the differences.

If vocational subjects in particular have significant common ground in pedagogical terms, this would support the currently developing notion of *vocational pedagogy,* in which the regional nature of vocational learning is made explicit:

> The best vocational teaching and learning combines theoretical knowledge from the underpinning disciplines (for example, maths, psychology, human sciences, economics) with the occupational knowledge of practice (for example, how to cut hair, build circuit boards, administer medicines). To do this, teachers, trainers and learners have to recontextualise theoretical and occupational knowledge to suit specific situations. (CAVTL 2013, p.15)

Any consideration of subject-specific pedagogy for vocational teachers therefore needs to take into account the need to develop these recontexualising abilities. There is some evidence to suggest that managers of vocational education can simply equate vocational pedagogy with expertise in a job, making the assumption that such teachers will model their excellent practice and that learners can unproblematically 'pick up' the same expertise in this way (Orr and Robinson 2013). In reality, the process is much more demanding; it involves a distinctive role

for vocational teachers, in which they 'reformulate vocational knowledge from work where it has mainly a productive function to a teaching-learning function, and they make this recontextualised vocational knowledge comprehensible to others' (Moodie and Wheelahan 2012, p.326). It is at least arguable that helping new teachers to do this might most effectively take place through regional or generic vocational groupings and resources, rather than using single vocational contexts in isolation.

3.2.3 Vertical and horizontal knowledge

The distinction between singular and regional subjects does not exhaust the knowledge structures currently made available through education and training. Bernstein (2000, p.53) identifies a generic mode of performance which has arisen more recently, associated particularly with notions of life skills and employability, and which is mainly found in the education and training sector. Generic modes are produced 'by a functional analysis of what is taken to be the underlying features necessary to the performance of a skill, task, practice or even area of work' (p.53) and include self-presentation skills, time management, literacy/numeracy, interpersonal skills and CV writing. Although these generic features are present in many educational contexts, embedded within singulars or particularly regions, in generic modes they are often found largely abstracted from their original context and become, in a sense, 'subjects' in their own right. For teachers of generic modes, subject knowledge *per se* is extremely limited in scope and largely elementary; by contrast, pedagogical content knowledge, linked to the challenges facing learners who have often experienced educational and social disadvantage, may assume much greater importance than in other areas.

The final point concerning the relation between knowledge structures and subject specialism is that pedagogy is not independent of the nature of the knowledge reproduced in educational systems. As Fuller and Unwin (2011) observe, 'The way knowledge is conceptualised and integrated in vocational curricula is a critical indicator of the character of provision, including the extent to which it provides a platform for progression and supports the development of "vocational practice"' (p.197). Another distinction made by Bernstein is useful here, which is between 'vertical' and 'horizontal' forms of knowledge. Vertical knowledge 'takes the form of a coherent, explicit and systematically principled structure' (Bernstein 2000, p.157), as in the sciences; or it has other specialised features and criteria which distinguish it from common-sense knowledge, as in the social sciences or humanities. Horizontal knowledge is often tacit or otherwise informally transmitted, and lacks generality; as Bernstein puts it, horizontal knowledge is *segmented*, in the sense that it is associated closely with particular contexts and sites of practice, and can be contradictory between different segments. Horizontal knowledge is especially prevalent in curricula based on generic modes.

Horizontal knowledge as such is not necessarily problematic: as Bernstein points out, it may be highly relevant and effectual in a particular context, and may comprise repertoires of strategies rather than a single inflexible practice. However, possessing horizontal knowledge alone can be severely limiting, both in a social sense in terms of depriving learners of higher-status knowledge, and in a pragmatic sense of reducing one's ability to operate effectively across contexts or in uncertain and shifting environments. Indeed, Lucas (2007, p.101) suggests that the 'fundamental pedagogic problem' for teacher educators can be expressed as the problem of how to bring together the horizontal knowledge associated with practical pedagogy in the workplace with the vertical knowledge embodied in many subject areas and in the formal theories of learning encountered in ITE.

Although the distinction between vertical and horizontal knowledge is sometimes expressed in terms of the distinction between abstract and concrete concepts, Bernstein points out that all knowledge is abstract – what counts is the form the abstraction takes. Where abstraction leads to greater generality and explanatory power, the opportunity to recognise relations and wider meanings, we have vertical knowledge; where abstraction remains closely tied to a specific material base, we have horizontal knowledge. Vocational curricula are particularly vulnerable to penetration by horizontal knowledge structures, and numerous authors have raised concerns about the implications of this for social justice and the nature of vocational education (see, for example, Wheelahan 2010; Fuller and Unwin 2011; Bathmaker 2013). Awareness of the assumptions about knowledge inherent in curricula, and the opportunity to consider their pedagogical implications, should form an important part of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge.

3.3 DEVELOPING SUBJECT-SPECIALIST PEDAGOGY IN ITE

We now consider the possible pedagogical arrangements in ITE for developing trainees' subject-specific pedagogical knowledge (SPK), and their associated pedagogical practice. The potential effectiveness of these arrangements, their implications for the professional development of teacher educators, and the suitability of different ITE routes will also be discussed. Although the focus of the discussion is mainly on subject-specific pedagogical knowledge, similar considerations apply to the development of pedagogy as practice, and the terms SPK and subject-specialist pedagogy will be used fairly interchangeably.

As a starting point, we may take ideal types at the extremes of two dimensions to construct a matrix of possible pedagogical arrangements for the development of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge. These dimensions are formed by the answers to two questions:

- To what extent is SPK made available in the ITE curriculum as a distinctive body of knowledge?
- To what extent is SPK developed discretely, according to subject specialism, or generically in mixed-subject delivery?

The answers to these questions are contingent, and will vary according to subject area, the nature of the ITE provision, and also according to factors relating to the broader social organisation of the subject. This latter point is important, as the distinctiveness of SPK is strongly associated with the existence of such communities. For example, in subjects such as mathematics where strong singular identities have developed, we find professional associations, specialist qualifications such as master's programmes for serving teachers, and developed research communities with their own specialist journals and agendas. Elements of SPK, such as how to teach central concepts in the subject or aspects of learner development, are staple concerns of these communities; these may also be able to develop a relative autonomy strong enough to resist or at least moderate external influences such as government interventions. Subjects which have developed in this way may provide an appearance of highly-distinctive SPK, even though their educational problematics may have much in common with those of other subjects. The question of to what extent subjects are recognised in the ITE curriculum as having a distinctive pedagogical character beyond their content is therefore not merely an epistemological question about whether subject-specific pedagogical knowledge (SPK) is just contextualised generic pedagogical knowledge; it also relates to the ways in which specific subjects have developed in their social context.

The structure of ITE courses is also an important factor. In her small-scale study of teacher knowledge, Maxwell (2010) found little evidence that trainee teachers had access to, or were able to generate, forms of knowledge analogous to Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge. As she points out, this finding is inconclusive; leaving aside the small sample size, it may suggest that Shulman's conception of teacher knowledge is inadequate, or may point to failings in the training the teachers received. However, Maxwell's finding may reflect the contingency noted above, suggesting that, in the particular subject areas represented in her study, pedagogical content knowledge either does not exist or was not made available in the ITE curriculum. This may not have been the case if other subject areas had been represented.

The corresponding ideal types are indicated in Figure 4, according to whether the distinctiveness of subject pedagogy is strong or weak, and also in terms of the strength of the 'framing' of delivery (that is, the degree of separation between ITE students in different subjects and the attention given to subject-specific elements of pedagogy). This leads to four modalities or pedagogical arrangements. See the paragraphs on Modes A–D below.



Figure 4: Modalities for developing subject-specific pedagogical knowledge

Mode A: Distinctive SPK is made available and is developed through discrete provision for the subject
This would occur when distinctive subject-specific bodies of knowledge about teaching and learning are contained within the ITE curriculum *and* a significant part of the training takes place through subject-specific delivery. For example, a substantial literature may exist on how students learn about the subject, the conceptions/misconceptions formed by learners, emotional responses to the subject, the way that concepts can be developed effectively, and the pedagogical practices which have developed to enable learning. At the same time, the curriculum may be delivered by ITE tutors with expertise in the subject and its pedagogy, to subject-specialist cohorts – either face-to-face or through blended learning. Perhaps the most obvious examples of this mode would be ITE for secondary school subjects such as mathematics, but the Specialist Diplomas in Education and Training aimed at teachers of adult literacy and numeracy would, if delivered through subject-specialist cohorts, also fall into this category.

Mode B: Distinctive SPK is made available but is developed through generic provision
As in Mode A, a distinctive subject-specific body of knowledge about teaching and learning is made available within the ITE curriculum. However, in Mode B curriculum delivery is within broader groupings with a range of subjects represented. The tutor may not be a specialist in the subject, although blended learning resources may be available to enable trainees to pursue subject-specific literature and practices. This mode would rely heavily on subject-specific mentoring in the trainee teacher's workplace. A specific example of Mode B might be a suite of Specialist Diplomas in Education and Training delivered to a single cohort containing teachers of literacy, numeracy, ESOL and learners with disabilities.

Mode C: Distinctive SPK is not made available, but generic pedagogical knowledge is developed through discrete provision for the subject
In this mode, either no distinctive subject-specific pedagogical knowledge exists in codified form, or the curriculum does not provide opportunities to explore it. Although tutor and trainees may share a specialism, this is not exploited in depth and the content largely focuses on generic elements of lesson planning, behaviour management, and teaching methods. There is little attempt to explore how subject-specific concepts may be developed or assessed, although broader aspects of teaching and learning are dealt with. Trainees' subject-specific experience is used largely to highlight generic aspects of pedagogy.

Mode D: Distinctive SPK is not made available, and generic pedagogical knowledge is developed through generic provision
Here, the curriculum focuses entirely on generic issues of teaching, learning and assessment, and subject-specific issues are used mainly to identify common ground and to establish or apply general pedagogical principles. Subject-specific pedagogy, if it takes place at all, is confined to independent development or work with a mentor. This mode may be taken as an extreme case of the sort of ITE provision which existed prior to 2003, and which was the subject of the Ofsted criticisms discussed earlier.

These modalities are, of course, ideal types, and actual ITE provision will contain combinations and modifications of them. However, they do indicate the possible arrangements of ITE pedagogy concerning subject-specialist issues. They also illustrate the importance of the epistemological and social nature of the subject area involved and the way in which these are reflected in the ITE curriculum. We should not expect the same model to be appropriate for singular, regional and generic modes of knowledge.

3.4 SUBJECT PEDAGOGY AND THE CURRENT SYSTEM OF QUALIFICATIONS

The preceding discussion provides a basis for evaluating the potential of the current routes for developing subject-specialist pedagogy. The first point to be made is that, given the complexity of the issues involved and the depth of treatment necessary, it is unlikely that the Award in Education and Training or the Certificate in Education and Training could provide sufficient opportunity for an adequate treatment of subject-specialist pedagogy in subject areas having a distinctive SPK. This is why specialist qualifications in literacy, numeracy and ESOL are not available at Award or Certificate level; the role of these two awards is to provide a grounding in generic pedagogical issues and, where possible, to begin the development of subject-specialist pedagogy.

This leaves the Level 5 Diplomas and their university equivalents. In some ways, it might appear that subject areas having a distinctive SPK would benefit from the specialist diploma model, in which an explicit core of SPK is contained in the curriculum, and the teaching experience of trainees and the expertise of tutors are both regulated. This would support Mode A pedagogy in ITE and would correspond closely to the situation in school teaching. However, there are two possible objections to this conclusion. Firstly, as pointed out earlier, the effectiveness of these modes should be treated as an empirical question – it is not self-evident that Mode A should be the model in these subject areas. Secondly, even if Mode A is the most effective approach in certain subjects, the experience with the specialist Diplomas indicates that the viability of ITE programmes may be affected, or the trainee experience diminished by very small groupings. Alternatively, a Mode B approach could be adopted, with a specialist focus in the curriculum but a more weakly regulated delivery model. This would create a need for greatly enhanced mentor training, and for training to enable teacher educators to manage groups of subjects, as both tutors and mentors would have responsibility in different ways for addressing appropriate SPK for each trainee. It would also create a need for blended learning approaches so that broader issues raised in generic or regional groups could be pursued in a subject-specific way.

The approaches indicated above are not necessarily appropriate for subject areas which do not have distinctive SPK. In such cases, fully generic groups, led by tutors skilled in eliciting key generic pedagogical knowledge from the experiences and contexts represented in a group of trainees, may well be the most effective mode of delivery. Although mentors would still have a role in supporting subject knowledge, they would also need to know how their subject area related to generic pedagogical knowledge. The idea of vocational pedagogy discussed earlier could here be of great importance in providing unifying principles which would structure the relationship between the specialist context and generic pedagogy. Blended learning approaches could also be important in this type of model, but as with mentoring their focus would be on how the subject context relates to vocational pedagogy.

There is no compelling reason why pre-service routes would be more or less effective than in-service, although the challenges would be different. There is perhaps more scope for developing SPK in pre-service routes, particularly if the provision is large enough to support subject-specialist groupings (either regional or singular, or possibly based on client groups). However, in-service programmes may provide more scope for the practical application of SPK. Perhaps the key issue here is not the mode of delivery but the quality of the practical teaching experience provided, including mentoring and other forms of support from workplace staff.

Similarly, there is no reason why – in principle – university or awarding organisation provision should be more effective, although there is some evidence that the perceptions of trainees and teacher educators might favour university provision (Simmons and Walker 2013). However, even if this is the case more broadly, this is likely to be related to the quality of teacher educators rather than any fundamental weakness in the award itself.

Some caution is needed in relation to the role of mentors in supporting subject-specific pedagogy. Firstly, mentors themselves may be less than secure in terms of SPK, particularly if they have been trained through generic programmes. Being an experienced subject teacher does not necessarily imply a secure knowledge of subject or pedagogy. Secondly, even mentors with secure knowledge themselves may be less skilled at helping trainees to develop this knowledge. Finally, there is evidence to suggest that a great deal of mentoring work centres around generic rather than subject-specialist aspects (Hobson et al. 2012); whilst there is no suggestion that this is not a valuable form of support, it does remind us that reality may fall short of our assumptions about the effectiveness of subject-specific mentoring.

Similar considerations apply to teacher educators themselves. There is very little empirical research on the knowledge and skills of teacher educators in the education and training sector. However, what is known suggests that becoming an ITE tutor is as much a matter of chance as becoming a teacher in the education and training sector is often said to be (Noel 2006). Training and professional development as a teacher educator, even in the generic aspects of ITE, is limited and the extent to which teacher educators in the sector are trained to develop subject-specific pedagogical knowledge is questionable, to say the least. For this reason, the quality of teacher educators must rank alongside the quality of mentors as important pre-requisites for developing enhanced subject-specialist pedagogy. These broader issues are likely to be as significant as developments to ITE curricula.

It is therefore appropriate to end this section with both suggestions and research questions for enhancing subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE for the sector. *Suggestions* include the following:

- Only the Level 5 Diploma qualifications and their university counterparts have sufficient depth and breadth to develop subject-specialist pedagogies of any degree of sophistication.
- A 'one size fits all' approach cannot be used. Curricula need to be flexible enough to support the development of pedagogies for singular, regional and generic knowledge structures. Although opportunities to develop the most appropriate forms of subject-specialist and generic pedagogical knowledge should be provided, trainees should also be able to see how their own subject pedagogies relate to the broader picture.
- Serious consideration would need to be given to viability in any attempt to extend the notion of specialist diplomas to further subject areas. Blended learning resources dealing with SPK across a range of subject areas would be valuable, but could not be the whole solution.
- In 'regional' collections of subjects and in generic curricula (such as employability courses) the notion of a vocational pedagogy appears to hold greater promise than a narrow focus on subject-specialist pedagogy. However, vocational pedagogies will also need supporting by more specialised pedagogical knowledge relating to relevant component disciplines.

- Teacher educators and mentors will, in different ways, require training to support them in identifying and developing SPK.

In addition, *research* into the following questions would enable a considered evaluation of different approaches to subject-specialist pedagogy in ITE:

- What kinds of knowledge do trainee teachers draw on, and how do they integrate this knowledge in their developing practice? More specifically, how do trainees experience the development of their subject-specialist pedagogy, not just through mentoring but also in the ITE classroom and in directed study?
- How do trainees, teacher educators and mentors view SPK in particular subject areas – what does it consist of and is there any consensus?
- What strategies do specialist teacher educators and mentors use to develop subject-specialist pedagogy in trainees, and how effective are they? This question would also relate to how trainees and tutors/mentors integrate work-based learning and the more formal parts of the ITE programme.
- How do generic teacher educators draw on subject-specialist contexts and pedagogies to illustrate generic pedagogical points? How do they support trainees in independently (or with a mentor) pursuing subject-specialist pedagogy?

APPENDIX 1 NATIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

Since the introduction of the first set of standards for teaching in further education (FENTO 1999), there has been continuing professional and academic debate over the effectiveness of standards as a means of codifying professional knowledge, values and behaviour. As Nasta (2007, p.3) points out, these standards 'make an implicit assumption that it is possible to capture in written statements ... the richness and complexities involved in the process of teaching'. This underlying assumption overlooks, not merely the complexity of the teacher behaviours involved and the difficulty of capturing them in written language, but also the processes of mediation involved in translating the intentions of policy makers into any form of consistent behaviour on the ground. Lucas (2007) argues that the problems caused by such mediation encourage regulatory bodies to adopt a mechanistic, 'tick-box' approach in which much of the original meaning of the standards is lost.

A further difficulty was that, although intended as descriptions of the occupational competence of experienced teachers, both the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO) standards and the Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) standards which followed them were also used as the basis for recognition of FE teaching qualifications. Both university and national awarding body courses were required to undergo the process of endorsement against these teaching standards, even though it was widely recognised that there were problems associated with using the standards for this dual purpose. The FENTO standards in particular were criticised as being unhelpful to the development of trainee teachers (Lucas 2004b), and according to Ofsted (2003, p.36) were 'not an appropriate tool for designing ITT courses or for judging the final attainment of newly-qualified FE teachers'.

From September 2007, ITE courses for the lifelong learning sector (other than courses for teachers working solely in higher education) were based – indirectly, as discussed earlier – on a new set of professional standards developed by Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK), the successor organisation to FENTO and one of 25 Sector Skills Councils established from 2002 to cover all sectors of the economy. The LLUK teaching standards, although described as 'professional', continued the occupational-industrial approach used by FENTO, with around 150 separate statements describing the commitments, knowledge and practical abilities expected of those in a full teaching role. As well as attempting to increase the profile of subject-specialist pedagogy, these standards were 'developed specifically to respond to calls from Ofsted for clearer standards which new entrants to teaching in the sector should be expected to demonstrate, and which are relevant to teachers, tutors and trainers across the whole sector' (LLUK, 2006: i). However, their success in achieving this was limited, and the difficulties identified by Lucas, Nasta and others continued to be inherent within the LLUK standards. Furthermore, the mediating layer of regulation between the standards and ITE courses – the LLUK units of assessment – were seen by many as inflexible and too prescriptive, as 'hoops to jump through' as one survey respondent wrote (Lucas et al. 2012, p.692).

The LLUK standards 'describe, in generic terms, the skills, knowledge and attributes required of those who perform the wide variety of teaching and training roles undertaken within the sector with learners and employers' (LLUK 2006: ii), and express the 'key purpose' of the teacher as being 'to create effective and stimulating opportunities for learning through high quality teaching that enables the development and progression of all learners' (LLUK 2006: 2). They are divided into six areas, or domains: professional values and practice (domain A); learning and teaching (domain B); specialist learning and teaching (domain C); planning for learning (domain D); assessment for learning (domain E); and access and progression (domain F). Each domain is further divided into three sets of statements, relating to: professional values; professional knowledge and understanding; and professional practice. Although the term 'professional values' might suggest a set of broad principles underpinning professional conduct, the approach taken by the LLUK standards is to list specific things which teachers are expected to 'value', together with behaviours taken to represent their application in each domain.

Until very recently, the LLUK standards remained as the formal basis for ITE in the sector, although from 2010 other elements of the national policy context, such as the revisions to the qualifications framework completed by LSIS in 2011 and successive Ofsted inspection frameworks, had arguably played a more important role in shaping post-compulsory ITE. However, in May 2014 the LLUK standards were replaced by a considerably slimmed-down set of standards developed by the newly-formed Education and Training Foundation (ETF). In its delivery plan, the Foundation had undertaken to revise and simplify the LLUK standards, producing a set of draft standards for consultation in January 2014 and releasing the final version in May. The Foundation describes these standards as intended to:

- set out clear expectations of effective practice in Education and Training;
- enable teachers and trainers to identify areas for their own professional development;
- provide a national reference point which organisations can use to support the development of their staff. (ETF 2014b, p.1)

Unlike the LLUK standards, those produced by the Foundation have no regulatory force, although it is hoped that 'employers will recognise the value of being able to refer to a national set of standards to support their own organisation's recruitment, performance management and staff development policies and procedures' (p.6). Moreover, the Foundation anticipates that Ofsted will use the new standards as part of their inspection process for ITE in the education and training sector. The problematic dual purpose of teaching standards aimed simultaneously at experienced and beginning teachers, therefore looks set to carry over from the LLUK standards. This is compounded by the fact that the term itself is not entirely appropriate. As with their predecessors, the ETF standards are standardised – that is, common to the whole sector – but are not standards in the sense of defining levels of performance. They are in fact more-or-less broad statements of the things teachers might be expected to value, know or do at any stage of their career, and sometimes make unwarranted assumptions about the degree of consensus there might be around certain points, for example the theoretical underpinning of what the standards describe as effective practice.

The ETF standards are based on the expectation that teachers in the sector, 'are "dual professionals"; they are both subject and/or vocational specialists and experts in teaching and learning' (ETF 2014b, p.1). However, it is not entirely clear how the standards will support the development of subject-specialist pedagogy, and in fact they contain minimal reference to these aspects of teacher professionalism. Although the guidance document associated with the standards promises that 'contextualised case studies may be developed in time' (ETF 2014c, p.4), any further conception of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge (see Section 3) is not engaged with, raising concerns that equating subject pedagogy with subject knowledge may not be a thing of the past.

APPENDIX 2 THE ACADEMIC LEVELS OF ITE QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SECTOR

Prior to 2001, the academic levels of both awarding body and university ITE qualifications for the education and training sector were relatively low. The City & Guilds 730 Certificate, an ITE qualification taken by many intending and beginning FE teachers, was at Level 3, whilst the Certificate in Education programmes offered by many universities were typically at Level 4. Even the university-based Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) was, in common with its equivalents aimed at intending schoolteachers, postgraduate 'in time' rather than in level. Although the PGCE normally required an undergraduate degree as an entry qualification, the PGCE itself did not contain postgraduate level credit. Indeed, even the proportion of credit at Level 6 could be quite low in the PGCE. For example, one provider offered in the 1990s a PGCE (Professional Graduate Certificate in Education, PCET), which comprised 100 credits at Level 4 and 20 credits at Level 6.

The explanation for this state of affairs may be traced in part to the assumptions about pedagogy and professionalism discussed earlier. As long as subject knowledge at a level commensurate with the levels taught was regarded as largely synonymous with teaching ability, the academic level of the ITE course was not a major consideration. Furthermore, many ITE students in the sector themselves had a limited educational background, and requiring them to study, *in education*, at a significantly higher level than their own subject qualifications was generally regarded as problematic and likely to reduce uptake of the then-voluntary ITE qualifications. Although for graduates academic level was not an issue *per se*, the implications of a change in discipline for PGCE students, who of course came from a wide variety of subject backgrounds, was also a consideration.

The introduction in 2001 of a statutory requirement for FE teachers to acquire an ITE qualification changed this situation in two significant ways. Firstly, as part of moves towards a greater 'professionalisation' of teaching in the sector, the minimum requirement for full qualification was the achievement of a Level 4 ITE award endorsed by the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO), such as the City & Guilds 7407. Although this did not affect the university programmes, which were already at Level 4 or above, it posed a greater challenge for trainee teachers following awarding body programmes. Secondly, the compulsory nature of the Level 4 awards meant that all new teachers (and, at least in principle, all unqualified existing teachers) in the sector would need to work to at least Level 4.

At the same time as the awarding body qualifications were being increased in level, the university programmes were also changing. As part of the Bologna Process establishing a European Higher Education Area, the nomenclature of awards is required to reflect their academic level. It was therefore necessary to distinguish between those PGCE programmes which were postgraduate in level (normally containing at least 60 credits at Level 7), and could therefore retain the title of Postgraduate Certificate in Education, and those which were not (QAA 2010). From 2005 onwards, when a joint statement was issued by the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), the Standing Committee of Principals (SCOP), Universities UK and the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) to provide guidance to HEIs on the naming of awards, PGCE programmes below Level

7 have been entitled *Professional Graduate Certificate in Education*, and typically contain at least 60 credits at Level 6 with the remainder at Levels 4 or 5.

These developments concerning the academic level of the PGCE, although significant for many trainee teachers and their employers, were arguably of considerably less importance than continuing government moves to increase the minimum required academic level of the compulsory ITE qualifications. Within the 2007 reforms, a crucial distinction was drawn between the qualifications associated with Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS), and those associated with Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) (Thompson and Robinson 2008). For QTLS, a minimum of Level 5 was required, further upgrading the academic level of programmes for those aiming at a full teaching role, whilst Levels 3 or 4 were sufficient for ATLS. To maintain their standing, the university Certificate in Education programmes also moved at this time to Level 5; indeed, some universities renamed their Cert Ed programmes using a version of the Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS) title. The most recent stage in the development of the academic levels required for ITE in the education and training sector has been the increased interest in Level 7 programmes, following the statement in the first Lingfield Report that such programmes should be available for those aspiring to the 'highest professional levels' (BIS 2012d, p.6), and by implication, that awarding bodies should be encouraged to develop such programmes in competition with universities.

REFERENCES

Avis, J. (2009) *Education, Policy and Social Justice: Learning and skills*, revised edn. London: Continuum.

Avis, J., Fisher, R. and Thompson, R. (2010) *Teaching in Lifelong Learning: A guide to theory and practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Bathmaker, A. (2013) Defining 'knowledge' in vocational educational qualifications in England: an analysis of key stakeholders and their constructions of knowledge, purpose and content. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training,* 65(1), 87-107.

Beale, D. (2004) The impact of restructuring in further education colleges. *Employee Relations*, 26(5), 465-479.

Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, research, critique*. Revised edition. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

BIS (2010) *Sector Skills Council Re-licensing Decision for Lifelong Learning UK*. Available online at www.gov.uk/government/news/sector-skills-council-relicensing-decision-for-lifelong-learning-uk (Accessed 11 March 2014).

BIS (2012a) *Evaluation of FE Teachers' Qualifications Regulations (2007)*. BIS Research Paper No. 66. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

BIS (2012b) *Hayes launches independent review of professionalism in the FE and skills sector*. Available online at www.gov.uk/government/news/hayes-launches-independent-review-of-professionalism-in-the-fe-and-skills-sector (Accessed 12 March 2014).

BIS (2012c) *Professionalism in Further Education: Interim Report of the Independent Review Panel Established by the Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning*. The Lingfield Interim Report. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

BIS (2012d) *Professionalism in Further Education: Final Report of the Independent Review Panel Established by the Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning*. The Lingfield Final Report. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

BIS (2012e) *Consultation on Revocation of the Further Education Workforce Regulations: Government response*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

BIS (2014) *Further Education Initial Teacher Training Bursary Guide Academic Year 2014/15*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

Browne, J. (2010) *Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education: An independent review of higher education funding & student finance*. London: Independent Review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance.

Bruler, C. (2001) *Assessment, Knowledge and the Curriculum: The effects of a competence-based approach to the training of teachers in further and adult education*. Open University: Unpublished EdD Thesis.

CAVTL (2013) *It's about work … Excellent adult vocational teaching and learning,* London: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

Chowdry, H. and Sibieta, L. (2011) *Trends in Education and Schools Spending*. IFS Briefing Note BN121. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Crawley, J. (2005) *In at the Deep End*. London: David Fulton.

Dent, H.C. (1954) *Growth in English Education 1946-1952*. Reprinted in 2007. Abingdon: Routledge.

DfE (2012) Teach First to recruit more top graduates. Press release, 26 November. Available online at www.gov.uk/government/news/teach-first-to-recruit-more-top-graduates (Accessed 27 April 2014).

DfE (2013) *Full-time enrolment of 14-16 year olds in further education and sixth form colleges*. London: Department for Education.

DfE (2014) *Initial Teacher Training: Trainee number census 2013 to 2014*. Statistical First Release SFR49/2013, updated 3 April 2014. London: Department for Education.

DfEE (1998) *The Learning Age: A renaissance for a new Britain*. Cm 3790. London: Department for Education and Employment.

DfEE (1999a) *Learning to Succeed: A new framework for post-16 learning*. Cm 4392. London: Department for Education and Employment.

DfEE (1999b) *A Fresh Start: Improving literacy and numeracy*. The Moser report. London: Department for Education and Employment.

DfES (2002) *Success for All*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

DfES (2003) *The Future of Higher Education*. Cm 5735. London: Department for Education and Skills.

DfES (2004a) *Equipping Our Teachers for the Future: Reforming initial teacher training for the learning and skills sector*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills Standards Unit.

Edward, S., Coffield, F., Steer, R. and Gregson, M. (2007) Endless change in the learning and skills sector: the impact on teaching staff. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 59(2), 155-173.

ETF (2014a) *The Education and Training Foundation*. Available online at www.et-foundation.co.uk/supporting/ (Accessed 20 August 2014).

ETF (2014b) *Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers in Education and Training – England*. London: Education and Training Foundation.

(ETF 2014c) *Initial Guidance for users of the Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers in Education and Training – England*. London: Education and Training Foundation. www.et-foundation.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/ETF-Prof-Standards-Guidance-v2-2.pdf (Accessed 6 September 2014)

FENTO (1999) *National Standards for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Further Education in England and Wales*. London: Further Education National Training Organisation.

FENTO (2004) *Addressing Language, Literacy and Numeracy Needs in Education and Training: Defining the minimum core of teachers' knowledge, understanding and personal skill. A guide for initial teacher education programmes*. London: Further Education National Training Organisation.

Finegold, P. (2012) *Subject Knowledge in Secondary Science Initial Teacher Training*. Summary Report. London: Wellcome Trust.

Fisher, R. (2010) Management, measurement and cultural change in the English further education college: 1963-1993. *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, 4(2), 119-130.

Fisher, R. and Webb, K. (2006) Subject-specialist pedagogy and initial teacher training for the learning and skills sector in England: the context, a response and some critical issues. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30(4), 337-349.

Fryer, R. H. (1997) *Learning for the Twenty-first century: first report of the National Advisory Group for continuing education and lifelong learning*. London: NAGCELL.

Fuller, A. and Unwin, L. (2003) Fostering workplace learning: looking through the lens of apprenticeship. *European Educational Research Journal*, 2(1), 41-55.

Fuller, A. and Unwin, L. (2011) Vocational education and training in the spotlight: back to the future for the UK's Coalition Government? *London Review of Education*, 9(2), 191-204.

Gleeson, D., Davies, J. and Wheeler, E. (2005) On the making and taking of professionalism in the further education workplace. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 26(4), 445-460.

Gleeson, D. and James, D. (2007) The paradox of professionalism in English further education: a TLC project perspective. *Educational Review* 59(4), 451-467.

Hodgson, A. and Spours, K. (2010) Vocational qualifications and progression to higher education: the case of the 14-19 Diplomas in the English system. *Journal of Education and Work*, 23(2), 95-110.

HM Government (2001) *The Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2001*. Statutory Instrument 2001 No. 1209. Norwich: The Stationery Office.

HM Government (2007a) *The Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007*. Statutory Instrument 2007 No. 2264. Norwich: The Stationery Office.

HM Government (2007b) *The Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations 2007*. Statutory Instrument 2007 No. 2116. Norwich: The Stationery Office.

HM Government (2012) *The Education (School Teachers) (Qualifications and Appraisal) (Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) Regulations 2012*. Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 431. Norwich: The Stationery Office.

Hobson, A., McIntyre, J., Ashby, P., Hayward, V., Stevens, A. and Malderez, A. (2012) *The Nature, Impact and Potential of External Mentoring for Teachers of Physics and other Subjects in England: Summary Report*. London: Gatsby Foundation.

Hodkinson, P. and James, D. (2003) Transforming learning cultures in further education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 55(4), 389-406.

IfL (2008a) *Licence to Practise: Professional Formation*. London: Institute for Learning.

IfL (2008b) *Promote: The Code of Professional Practice*. London: Institute for Learning.

IfL (2011) *What 5,000 further education teachers and trainers think about initial teacher training*. London: Institute for Learning.

IfL (2014) Gaining QTLS or ATLS: professional formation. Available online at www.ifl.ac.uk/cpd/qtls-atls (Accessed 22 March 2014).

James, D. and Biesta, G. (2007) *Improving Learning Cultures in Further Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kennedy, H. (1997) *Learning Works: Widening Participation in Further Education.* Coventry: Further Education Funding Council.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

LLUK (2005) *Further Education Workforce Data for England: An analysis of the Staff Individualised Record (SIR) for 2003-04*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2006) *New Overarching Professional Standards for Teachers, Tutors and Trainers in the Lifelong Learning Sector*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2007a) *New Overarching Professional Standards for Teachers, Tutors and Trainers in the Lifelong Learning Sector: Application of the professional standards for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL)*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2007b) *New Overarching Professional Standards for Teachers, Tutors and Trainers in the Lifelong Learning Sector: Application of the professional standards for teachers of mathematics (numeracy)*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2007c) *Teachers, Tutors and Trainers in the Further Education Sector in England: Guidance for awarding institutions on teacher roles and initial teaching qualifications*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2008) *Further Education Workforce Data for England: An analysis of the Staff Individualised Record data for 2006-07*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

LLUK (2011) *Further Education College Workforce Data for England: An analysis of the Staff Individualised Record data for 2009-10*. London: Lifelong Learning UK.

Lock, R., Salt, D. and Soares, A. (2011) *Acquisition of Science Subject Knowledge and Pedagogy in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Wellcome Trust.

LSIS (2011a) *Qualification Guidance for awarding organisations, awarding bodies and higher education institutions: Level 3 Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector; Level 4 Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector*. Coventry: LSIS.

LSIS (2011b) *Qualification Guidance for awarding organisations, awarding bodies and higher education institutions: Level 5 Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector*. Coventry: LSIS.

LSIS (2013a) *The Further Education, Skills and Wider Lifelong Learning Sector Workforce: Exploring the sector in England*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013b) *Work-Based Learning Workforce Survey 2011-12*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013c) *Adult and Community Learning Workforce Survey 2011-12*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013d) *Qualification Guidance for Awarding Organisations: Level 5 Diploma in Education and Training (QCF); Level 5 Diploma in Education and Training (QCF) including a specialist pathway*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013e) *Teaching and Training Qualifications for the Further Education and Skills Sector in England (2013): Guidance for higher education institutions*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013f) *Addressing literacy, language, numeracy and ICT needs in education and training: Defining the minimum core of teachers' knowledge, understanding and personal skills. A guide for initial teacher education programmes*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013g) *Qualification Guidance for Awarding Organisations: Level 4 Certificate in Education and Training (QCF)*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013h) *Qualification Guidance for Awarding Organisations: Level 3 Award in Education and Training (QCF)*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

LSIS (2013i) *Teaching and Training Qualifications for the Further Education and Skills Sector in England (2013): Guidance for employers and practitioners*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.

Lucas, B., Claxton, G. and Webster, R. (2010) *Mind the gap. Research and reality in practical and vocational education.* London: Edge Foundation.

Lucas, B., Spencer, E. and Claxton, G. (2012) *How to teach vocational education: A theory of vocational pedagogy.* London: City & Guilds.

Lucas, N. (2004a) *Teaching in Further Education: New Perspectives for a Changing Context.* London: Bedford Way Papers.

Lucas, N. (2004b) The 'FENTO Fandango': national standards, compulsory teaching qualifications and the growing regulation of FE college teachers. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28(1), 35-51.

Lucas, N. (2007) Rethinking initial teacher education for further education teachers: from a standards-led to a knowledge-based approach. *Teaching Education*, 18(2), 93-106.

Lucas, N. and Unwin, L. (2009) Developing teacher expertise at work: in-service trainee teachers in colleges of further education in England. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 33(4), 423-433.

Lucas, N., Nasta, T. and Rogers, L. (2012) From fragmentation to chaos? The regulation of initial teacher training in further education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 677-695.

Maguire, S. (2013) Will Raising the Participation Age (RPA) solve the NEET problem in England? *Research in Post-Compulsory Education,* 18(1-2), 61-75.

Maxwell, B. (2010) Teacher knowledge and initial teacher education in the English learning and skills sector. *Teaching Education*, 21(4), 335-348.

Moodie, G. and Wheelahan, L. (2012) Integration and fragmentation of post compulsory teacher education. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 64(3), 317-331.

Nasta, T. (2007) Translating national standards into practice for the initial training of further education (FE) teachers in England. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 12(1), 1-17.

Noel, P. (2006) The secret life of teacher educators: becoming a teacher educator in the learning and skills sector. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 58(2), 151-170.

Ofsted (2003) *The Initial Training of Further Education Teachers: A survey*. London: Office for Standards in Education.

Ofsted (2009) *The Initial Training of Further Education Teachers*. London: Office for Standards in Education.

Orr, K. (2009) *College Cultures and Pre-Service Trainee Teachers: A study in the creation and transmission of ideas about teaching.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Huddersfield.

Orr, K. (2010) The entry of 14-16-year-old students into colleges: implications for further education initial teacher training in England. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 34(1), 47-57.

Orr, K. and Robinson, D. (2013) What is vocational pedagogy and who is it for? In: *Journal of Vocational Education and Training 10th International Conference*, 5th-7th July 2013, Worcester College, Oxford. Unpublished conference paper. Available online at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/18762/ (Accessed 14 March 2014).

Parry, J. (1966) The Russell report: The supply and training of teachers for Further Education. *The Vocational Aspect of Education*, 18(41), 157-163.

Poulson, L. (2001) Paradigm lost? Subject knowledge, primary teachers and education policy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 49(1), 40-55.

Pring, R., Hayward, G., Hodgson, A., Johnson, J., Keep, E., Oancea, A., Rees, G., Spours, K. and Wilde, S. (2009) *Education for All: The future of education and training for 14-19 year olds*. London: Routledge.

QAA (2010) *The Bologna Process in Higher Education*. Gloucester: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Raffe, D. (1979) The 'alternative route' reconsidered: part-time further education and social mobility in England and Wales. *Sociology*, 13, 47-73.

Richardson, W. (2007) Perspectives on vocational education and training in post-war England. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 59(3), 273-277.

Robson, J. (2006) *Teacher Professionalism in Further and Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Sfard. A. (1998) On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4-13.

Shulman, L. (1986) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L. (1987) Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Shulman, L., & Shulman, J. (2004) How and what teachers learn: a shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2), 257-271.

Simmons, R. (2009a) Further education and the lost opportunity of the Macfarlane Report. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 33(2), 159-169.

Simmons, R. (2009b) The long goodbye: how local authorities lost control of further education. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 14(3), 287-297.

Simmons, R. and Thompson, R. (2007) Aiming higher: How will universities respond to changes in initial teacher training for the post-compulsory sector in England? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31(2), 171-182.

Simmons, R. and Walker, M. (2013) A comparative study of awarding organisation and HEI initial teacher training programmes for the lifelong learning sector in England. *Professional Development in Education*, 39(3), 352-368.

TDA (2007) *Developing Trainees' Subject Knowledge for Teaching: A way of looking at subject knowledge for teaching*. London: Training and Development Agency for Schools.

Thompson, R. (2009) Social class and participation in further education: evidence from the Youth Cohort Study of England and Wales. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(1), 29-42.

Thompson, R. (2010) Teaching on the margins: tutors, discourse and pedagogy in work-based learning for young people. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 62(2), 123-137.

Thompson, R. and Robinson, D. (2008) Changing step or marking time? Teacher education reforms for the learning and skills sector. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(2), 161-173.

Thompson, R. and Simmons, R. (2013) Social mobility and post-compulsory education: revisiting Boudon's model of social opportunity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(5-6), 744-765.

Wheelahan, L. (2010) *Why Knowledge Matters in Curriculum. A social realist argument.* London: Routledge.

Wolf, A. (2011) *Review of Vocational Education*. The Wolf Report. London: Department for Education/Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

Young, M.F.D. (2008) *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education*. London: Routledge.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACL	Adult and Community Learning
APL	Accreditation of prior learning
ATLS	Associate Teacher Learning and Skills
BIS	Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
CAVTL	Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CTLLS	Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector
DTLLS	Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector
ESOL	English for speakers of other languages
ETF	Education and Training Foundation
FE	Further Education
FENTO	Further Education National Training Organisation
HEA	The Higher Education Academy
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HNC	Higher National Certificate
HND	Higher National Diploma
IfL	Institute for Learning
ITE	Initial teacher education
ITT	Initial teacher training
LEA	Local Education Authority
LLUK	Lifelong Learning UK
LSIS	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
ONC	Ordinary National Certificate
OND	Ordinary National Diploma
PGCE	Post-Graduate Certificate in Education
PCET	Professional Certificate in Education
PTLLS	Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
QCF	Qualifications and Credit Framework
QTLS	Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
RPL	Recognition of prior learning
SCOP	Standing Committee of Principals
TDA	Training and Development Agency for Schools
TDLB	Training and Development Lead Body
UCET	Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers
WBL	Work-based learning
YOP	Youth Opportunities Programme
YTS	Youth Training Scheme

The Gatsby Charitable Foundation
The Peak, 5 Wilton Road, London SW1V 1AP
T +44 (0)20 7410 0330 www.gatsby.org.uk
Registered Charity number 251988